A STUDY OF THE PASTORAL EPISTLES

The importance of the Pastoral Epistles lies in the fact that they express ideas current in their environment. These epistles can only have their full value when viewed against their background. They exhibit an advanced Christianity, one that has a controlled leadership as well as a developed content of belief. Therefore, it is my conviction that they were written to meet the needs of their day, and that they reflect that period in history.

The historical tension and character of the Pastoral Epistles reflects the church's stand. The organization and ministry, the liturgy, the formulation of the kergyma, the ethics, and theology reflect the condition of the church at the time of the writing of these epistles. They were formed by their environment, and became a window for the development of the early church.

My objective is to relate the historical situation in the Pastorals and try to validate the fact that this situation created what is found in these letters. The epistles mirror their time, and this is what I want to demonstrate in my thesis.

My method is to show how the situation had a real impression on such things as the organization, worship, ethics and theology. Thus, I want to relate it to its time in history. The details of this are in my outline, but a short summary is as follows:

SECTION ONE: a study of date, destination and authorship of these epistles, giving internal and external evidence.

SECTION TWO: a study of the history of Christian organization, the different theories of church organization and the Pastoral account of church organization.

SECTION THREE: a study of the Jewish form of worship, the early Christian worship and the character of worship in the Pastorals.

SECTION FOUR: a survey of the Graeco-Roman world (political, social, thought, and religious background), and the ethics of the Pastorals in relation and reaction to it.

SECTION FIVE: a study of Gnosticism, gnosis in the New Testament, the pattern of the Pastoral heresy and the theology of the Pastoral Epistles which developed from this background.

SECTION SIX: some ideas on the value of the Pastorals for the twentieth century church.

In other words, the need of the day changed the church and its ministry. The situation created the outcome. The author wrote to those instances. The epistles reflect a situational approach, not a formal approach, to this era of history. One can see the effects of the church's growing pains as well as its moulded organization, its Jewish-Gnostic threats from the outside as well as its theological stance from the inside.

Insert page 184:

The political, social, thought and religious environment of the first and second century set a foundation for Christian ethics to grow. The ethic of the Christian was developed in two ways - reaction to the environment, and developement of the Christian ethic up to this period in history.

A STUDY OF THE PASTORAL EPISTLES

Against Their Contemporary Background and an Examination of Their Relevance for Today

L. Kim Porter

University of Glasgow.

1970

APPRECIATION

..... to Professor William Barclay, Glasgow University, for his constructive criticism and gifted guidance.

..... to Dr. Charles Laymon, Florida Southern College, for opening my eyes to new avenues of thought.

..... to my wife, Pattie, without whose loving care and divine patience this thesis would have never been completed.

..... to the youth and adults, who financially and spiritually encouraged me to continue.

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to two koinonia groups - one, in Atlanta, Georgia, the other in Lakeland, Florida - who offered me that unexplainable strength through Christian fellowship and friendship.

OUTLINE

Preface

6. Presbyter p.43
   a) Relation to 'elder'
   b) Connection with 'bishop'
7. Overseer (or Bishop) p.43
   a) Secular Greek
      1) Homer
      2) Cynic-Stoic Philosophers
      3) Syrian Inscriptions
      4) Cult Associations
   b) LXX
   c) New Testament Usage
      1) Title of Christ
      2) Title Given to Leaders of the Church
   d) Ignatius and Didache

C. History of Christian Organization p.44
1. Acts Account
   a) Appointment of the Seven
   b) Elders
      1) Definite Order?
      2) Church Meeting a Situation
   c) Prophets and Teachers
   d) 'Episcopate' Missing
   e) Conclusion: No Definite Structure
2. Church Fathers Account p.47
   a) Clement of Rome
      1) Offices Mentioned
         (a) Older and Younger Men
         (b) Rulers
         (c) Bishop
         (d) Deacons
      2) No Established Monarchical Episcopate
   b) Ignatius
      1) Bishop
      2) Presbyters and Deacons
   c) Didache
      1) Classes of Ministers
      2) Line Drawn Between Apostles, Prophets, Teachers and Bishops and Deacons
         (a) Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers are not Localized and Inspired
         (b) Bishops and Deacons Localised and Elected
      3) The Triad
      4) Bishop and Deacons
         (a) Function
         (b) Lack of Mention of Presbyters
   d) Barnabas
      1) Mention of Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers
      2) Church Government May Not Exist
   e) Polycarp
      1) Two Ministries

(a) Deacons
(b) Presbyters
2) Overseer Missing
f) Shepherd of Hermas
1) Leaders
2) Deacons
3) Presbyters

3. Theories of Organization
a) J. B. Lightfoot
1) Grades of Ministry
(a) Diaconate
(b) Presbyterate
(c) Bishop and Presbyter Synonymous
2) Duties of Presbytery
(a) Rulers
(b) Instructors
3) Gentile Churches Development
(a) Supervision by Apostles on Visit
(b) Apostolic Delegate in Residence
b) Edwin Hatch
1) Influence of Secular Associations
2) Body of Officers
(a) Bishop
(1) Function
(2) Associated with System of Charity
(b) Presbyters
(1) Functions
(2) Place of Power
c) Charles Gore
1) Apostolic Times
2) Sub-Apostolic Times
(a) Council of Presbyters
(b) No Monarchical Episcopate
d) T. M. Lindsay
1) Acts Account
2) Guidance of Apostles
3) Change in Second Century
(a) Prophetic Ministry
(b) Local Ministry
4) End of Second Century
e) Adolf Harnack
1) Charismatic Leadership
2) Second Authoritative Position
3) Elected Officials
4) Monarchical Episcopate Began with Apostles
f) B. H. Streeter
1) Evolution of Church Order
2) Early Church not Modeled after Jerusalem
3) Acts Account
(a) President (or Bishop)
(b) Deacons
4) Prophets and Teachers
5) Elders

g) Maurice Goguel
1) Two Types of Ministries
(a) Charismatic Ministry
(b) Institutional Ministry
2) Not Clear-Cut Ministries

D. Pastoral Account of Organization and Ministry

p.69

1. 'Familia Dei'
a) Parousia has Passed
b) Stabilised Local Ministry
2. Idea of the Church
a) No Theory of Church in Pastorals
b) Connected to its Past
1) Different from Matthew
2) Different from Paul
c) Guarantor of Truth
1) Mission: One of Tradition
2) Method: One of Discipline
d) Understood Socially
3. Organizational Terminology
a) Consists of Only 10% of Text
b) Prophets Mentioned only in Passing
4. Timothy and Titus
a) No Official Titles
1) Timothy
(a) Minister
(b) Evangelist
(c) Man of God
2) Titus
b) Ordination
1) Ordained in Ministry?
2) Ordained as Paul's Companion?
3) Conclusion
c) Apostle's Delegates
1) Timothy
2) Titus
5. Grades of Local Ministry
a) Are Presbyters and Bishops Synonymous?
1) Bishop Referred to in the Singular
2) Conclusion: Same Office, Not Monarchical
b) Deacons
1) Qualities Similar to Bishop
2) Role of Service
3) Lower Ministry?
c) Women
1) Judaism: Women Inferior
2) Old Testament View
3) New Testament View
4) Deaconesses?
6. Character of Leadership
a) Bishop
1) Noble Task to Aspire
2) Role of Father

b) Presbyter
c) Deacon
1) To Be
2) Do Not
b) [illegible]
c) Deacon
1) To Be Tested
2) Do Not Teach
d) Widows
7. Conclusion

III. Worship (Section three) p. 91
A. Introduction
B. Jewish Form of Worship p. 92
1. Temple
a) Organization
b) Personnel
c) Law was Central
d) Daily Sacrifice
2. Synagogue
a) Origins
b) Not Rival to the Temple
c) Officers
d) Order of Divine Worship
1) Shema
2) Prayer
3) Scripture Lesson
(a) Law
(b) Prophets
(c) Translators
4) Blessing
C. Early Christian Worship p. 99
1. Acts Account of Worship
a) Temple
b) Synagogue
c) House Worship
d) Conclusion
2. Church Fathers Account of Worship
a) Clement of Rome
b) Ignatius
c) Epistle to Barnabas
d) The Didache
e) Polycarp
3. Justin Martyr
4. Jewish Influence on Early Christian Worship
a) Synagogues
b) Pre-Christian Elements in Jewish Liturgy
5. Forms in Early Christian Worship
a) Content of the Service
1) Reading of Scripture
2) Exhortation
3) Prayer
4) Psalms or Hymns
5) Amen
b) Day of Service
c) Eucharist
d) Baptism
e) Ordination

D. Character of Worship in the Pastorals p. 112

1. Elements of Worship
   a) Scripture Reading
   b) Exhortation
   c) Teaching
2. Hymns or Creeds
   a) 1 Timothy 2:5-6
   b) 1 Timothy 3:16
      1) Structure
      2) Message
   c) 2 Timothy 2:11-13
      1) Original Meaning
      2) Message
3. Prayer
   a) Types of Prayers
      1) Petitions and Supplications
      2) Prayers
      3) Intercession
      4) Thanksgiving
   b) Theme of Universality
      1) For all Men
      2) For Rulers
   c) Lifting Holy Hands
   d) Prayers for the Dead
4. Doxologies
   a) Pauline Thought
   b) New Features
      1) Jewish Influence
      2) Hellenistic Influence
5. Baptism
   a) Baptismal Formula
      1) Regeneration
      2) Renewal
   b) Baptism as Confession
6. Ordination
   a) Idea of the Gift
   b) Laying on of Hands
7. Eucharist
   a) Argument for Eucharistic Elements
   b) Not Eucharistic Reference
8. Women in Worship
   a) Her Deportment
      1) Morality
      2) Sobriety
      3) Outward Appearance
      4) Inner Character
   b) Learn in Silence
9. Conclusion

IV. Ethics (Section Four) p. 137

A. Introduction
B. Political Background

1. Alexander the Great
2. Death of City-State
3. The Roman Empire
   a) Continual Wars
   b) Destruction of the Middle Class

C. Social Background p.142
1. Luxury
   a) Dress
   b) Food
2. Cruelty
3. Amusements
   a) Circus
   b) Theater
   c) Arena
4. Place of Women
   a) Children
   b) Abortion
5. Sexual Laxity
6. Homosexuality
7. Slavery
   a) Slave: not a Persona
   b) Slave Labor
   c) Freedman
8. Conclusion to Social Background

D. The Thought Background p.154
1. Ancient Greek Philosophy
2. Philosophy Becomes Moral Philosophy
3. Streams of Philosophy
   a) Minor Streams
      1) Sceptics
      2) Cyrenaics
   b) Major Streams
      1) Epicureans
      2) Cynics
      3) Stoics
   c) Epictetus
   d) Gnosticism

E. Religious Background p.164
1. Greek Religion
   a) Polytheism
   b) Humanization of the gods
2. Ancient Religion in Rome
   a) The Pagus
   b) Death of old gods
3. Eastern Faiths
4. Astralism
5. Emperor Worship
   a) Influence of Augustus
      1) External Restoration
      2) Internal Restoration
   b) Failure as a Religious Power
6. Feeling of Helplessness

F. The Greek p. 181
1. His Independence
2. His Curiosity

G. The Roman p.182
   1. The Worker
   2. Stability Through the Law
H. The Jew p.182
   1. Character
   2. Hope: Keynote of Character
      a) Jewish Monotheism
      b) Jewish Ethic
   3. Result
I. The Ethic of the Pastorals p.184
   1. Is the Natural Product of a Religious Life
   2. Different from Paul
      a) Method Different
      b) Hellenistic Influence
      c) Ethicized Description of Christian Life
   3. Eusebeia
      a) Background p.186
         1) Latin
         2) Hellenistic
         3) LXX
         4) New Testament Usage
      b) Meaning of Eusebeia in the Pastorals
         1) It is Sound Doctrine
            (a) Avoiding Idle Gossip
            (b) Acknowledging Truth
         2) Kind of Life Every Christian Must Live
         3) Mark of Christian Leadership
            (a) Virtue of the Christian Leader
            (b) Aim of the Christian Leader
         4) It is Mission
            (a) Sense of Outreach
            (b) Man's Relation to God
         5) Can be Distorted
         6) Its Relation to Being Content
         7) Embodied in Christ
   4. Sophron p.194
      a) Background
         1) Greek World
         2) Septuagint and Hellenistic World
         3) Imperial Period
      b) Meaning of Sophron in the Pastorals
         1) Its Application in the Epistles
         2) Virtue for Every Part of Life
         3) Virtue of Leadership
            (a) Description of Overseer
            (b) Paralleled to Egkrates
         4) Mark of Christian Life
         5) It is Sober Wisdom
         6) Conclusion
   5. Semnos
      a) Its Relation to Kosmios and Hieroprepas p.200

b) Background
   1) Greek
   2) LXX
   3) Church Fathers
   4) New Testament Usage
c) Meaning of Semnos in the Pastorals
   1) Virtue of Every Person
   2) Virtue of Leadership
   3) Virtue of Discipline
   4) Visible Expression of the Christian

6. Dikaios and Hosios p.204
   a) Words and Derivations Grouped Together
   b) Background of Dikaios
      1) Greek Hellenistic World
      2) LXX
      3) New Testament Usage
   c) Background of Hosios
      1) Greek Usage
      2) Septuagint
      3) New Testament Usage
   d) Pastoral Use of Dikaios
      1) What a Man Should Be
      2) What a Man Should Follow
      3) Emphasis on the Legal Aspect
   e) Pastoral Use of Hosios
      1) Grouped with Sophron and Dikaios
      2) Man's Duty to God
      3) Man's Onward Expression in Prayer

7. Epieikes p.209
   a) Background of Epieikes
      1) Greek
      2) LXX
      3) Josephus and Philo
      4) New Testament Usage
   b) Pastoral Use of Epieikes
      1) Virtue of Christian Leadership
      2) Positive Christian Virtue
      3) Attitude of Fairmindedness

8. Kalos p.213
   a) Background
      1) Greek World
      2) Hellenistic World
      3) Latin World
      4) LXX
      5) New Testament Usage
   b) Meaning of Kalos in the Pastorals
      1) It is Linked:
         (a) With the Law
         (b) With the Military Images
         (c) With Your Occupation
         (d) With the Wealthy
      2) Goodness is Universal
      3) Virtue of the Christian
      4) Virtue of Christ Jesus
   c) Distinction Between Kalos and Agathos

9. Pattern of Ethical Teaching in the Pastorals p.218
   a) Theological Character of Pastoral Moral Teaching
      1) Sound Doctrine
      2) Clear Conscience
   b) Theological Virtues in the Pastorals
      1) Faith
      2) Love
      3) Hope
   c) Negative Ethic
      1) Lists of Vices
      2) Lists of Sins of False Teachers
   d) Leadership Ethic
      1) Appointed Leaders
         (a) Bishop
         (b) Deacon
      2) Charismatic Leaders
   e) Family Ethic
      1) Older Women
      2) Younger Women
      3) Men
      4) Widows
   f) Ethic of Punishment and Reward
   g) Ethic of Law
   h) Slave Ethic
   i) Ethic for the Rich
      1) Things They are Not to Do
      2) Things They are to Do
   j) Social Ethic
      1) Duty Toward Self
      2) Duty Toward Others
      3) Duty Toward State
   k) Ethic of Moderation
   l) Conclusion

V. Theology (Section Five) p.243
   A. Gnosticism
      1. Definition
         a) Terminology
         b) System of Syncretism
      2. History
         a) Voice of the Theologian
            1) Irenaeus
            2) Tertullian
            3) Clement of Alexandria
            4) Hippolytus
         b) Originating Causes
            1) Intellectualism
            2) Hellenistic Tendencies
            3) Oriental Mysticism
            4) Dualism
      3. Gnostic Systems
         a) Syrian Schools
            1) Simon Magnus
            2) Menander and Saturninus

b) Other Early Sects
1) Nicolaitans
2) Cerinthus
3) Ophites
c) Marcion
dc) Marcion
ed) Basilides
4. Fe) Valentinus
a) Saving Knowledge
b) Mythology
c) Freedom
d) Dualism
e) Other Suggestions
5. Relation to Judaism
a) Possible Jewish Origin
b) Fertile Source of Gnosticism

B. Gnosis in the New Testament
1. Introduction
2. Corinthian Churches
3. Ephesians and Colossians
4. Gospels
a) Synoptics
b) John
5. Other Epistles
a) 1 John
b) Jude
c) Hebrews

p.260

C. Pastoral Pattern of Heresy
1. Element of Mysticism
a) Myths
b) Genealogies
c) Magic
d) Summary
2. Element of Speculation
a) Vain Discussion
b) Godless Chatter
c) Controversy
d) Semantics
3. Element of Knowledge
a) Belief that Resurrection had Passed
b) Pride
c) False Knowledge
4. Element of Judaism
a) Law
b) Circumcision Party
5. Element of Asceticism
6. Conclusion
7. Results of Heresy
a) What the Heretic Does
b) Results of Heresy
c) Heretics in Relation to Truth

p.264

D. Theology of the Pastorals p.272
   1. What Determined the Theology
      a) Force Within the Church
      b) Force Outside the Church
   2. Nature of God p.273
      a) King of Kings
      b) Only Living God
      c) Creator
         1) Opposite Gnostic Thought
         2) Gives Life to Everything
      d) Dwells in the Unapproachable Light
      e) Hope
         1) Universally
         2) For the Desolate
         3) For the Wealthy
      f) Source of Inspiration
      g) Concept of His Titles
         1) Savior
            (a) Relation to Old Testament
            (b) Relation to Hellenistic Religion
            (c) Universal Salvation
            (d) Salvation Leads to Truth
            (e) Salvation as Manifested in the Word
            (f) Salvation as His Mercy
            (g) Salvation by Revelation
            (h) Salvation for a Purpose
               (1) Pauline Concept
               (2) Pastoral Concept
         2) Father
            (a) Stereotyped References
            (b) Relation to Sonship
   3. Concept of Jesus Christ
      a) Jesus of History p.283
         1) Humanity of Jesus
         2) His Appearing
         3) To Save Sinners
         4) Davidic Descent
         5) Resurrection
         6) Teaching Before Pontius Pilate
      b) Jesus as Divine
         1) Lord
            (a) Derivation of κύριος
            (b) Its Implications
         2) Judge
         3) Savior
            (a) Previous Usage of the Concept
            (b) Objective: to Save Sinners
            (c) Salvation by Revelation
            (d) Salvation by Sacrifice of Himself
            (e) Salvation by Sanctification
            (f) Salvation by His Grace
            (g) Salvation as Sacramentally Mediated

c) Mediator
1) Previous Usage in Rabbinic Judaism
2) New Testament Usage
(a) Hebrews and Galatians
(b) Pastorals
(1) Role is Exclusive
(2) Continued in Pauline Tradition
d) Close Association with God the Father
1) Definite Division Between God and Jesus Christ
2) Exception to Previous Point
(a) Previous Usage
(b) Linguistic Argument
(1) Analysis of μεγ-ές
(2) Analysis of ἐπιφανεία
(c) Conclusion
e) The Pre-Existent Christ

4. Eschatological Outlook p. 300
a) Concept of Eternal Life
1) Result of Faith
2) Fulfilment of a Promise
(a) Built Upon Hope
(b) Inheritance by Hope
b) Element of Immortality
c) The ἐπιφανεία

5. Concept of the Church p. 306
a) History of the Word
1) Greek Usage
2) Septuagint
3) People of Israel
b) Meaning in the Pastorals
1) Reference to Individual Responsibility
2) Reference to Universal Responsibility
(a) As God's Household
(b) As Pillar and Bulwark of Truth
3) Theme: How One Behaves

6. Concept of the Holy Spirit p. 310
a) Connected with the Past
1) Rebirth (Regeneration)
2) Renewal
b) Connected with the Present
1) Spirit Entrusts Responsibility
2) Dwells Within Man
c) Connected with the Future

7. Concept of Faith p. 314
a) Faith Identified with Christian Doctrine
1) Synonym for Orthodox Belief
2) Ethical Quality
b) Faith as a Fundamental Christian Attitude
1) A Subjected Way to Salvation
2) Doctrine of Justification by Faith Wanting
c) Faith Linked with Other Virtues
d) Pauline Use of Faith Missing

ABBREVIATIONS

AF	Lake, Apostolic Fathers
AW	de Pressense, The Ancient World and Christianity
BL	Burton, The Heresies of Apostolic Age (Bampton Lectures)
BS	Deismann, Biblical Studies
C	Commentaries, Barclay, Barrett, Guthrie, Hanson, Kelly, Scott
CE	Alexander, Christianity and Ethics; Hort, Christian Ecclesia
CEP	Lightfoot, St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians
CI	Barrett, Current Issues
CL	Harnack, Constitution and Law
D	Dictionaries, Buttrick, Hastings
E	Angus, The Environment of Early Christianity; Kasemann, Essays on New Testament Themes
ECD	Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines
ECW	Cullmann, Early Christian Worship
EDC	Grant, Early Days of Christianity
EJ	Hort, Epistle to St. James
EP	Alexander, The Ethics of St. Paul
F	Kasemann, Jesus Means Freedom
G	Grant, Gnosticism
GEC	Grant, Gnosticism and Early Christianity
GP	Wilson, The Gnostic Problem
GNT	Wilson, Gnosis in the New Testament
HC	Bevan, Hellenism and Christianity
HCE	Murray, A Handbook of Christian Ethics
HS	Swete, The Holy Spirit in the New Testament
JC	Hort, Judaistic Christianity
LAE	Deismann, Light from the Ancient East
MNTW	Barclay, More New Testament Words
MR	Angus, The Mystery Religions and Christianity
OEC	Hatch, The Early Organisation of the Early Christian Churches
PC	Bultmann, Primitive Christianity; Goguel, The Primitive Church
RBC	de Pressense, Religions Before Christ
RE	Fowler, The Religious Experience of the Roman Empire
RGE	Murray, The Rise of the Greek Epic
RQ	Angus, The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World
S	Hanson, Studies in the Pastoral Epistles
SCH	Murray, Stoic, Christian and Humanist
SES	Zeller, The Stoics, Epicureans and Sceptics
SS	Bevan, Stoics and Sceptics
SSS	Zeller, Socrates and the Socratic Schools
T	Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament; Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament; Kennedy, The Theology of the Epistles

*** When scripture is quoted, the Revised Standard Version is used.

PREFACE

The importance of the Pastoral Epistles lies in the fact that they express ideas current in their environment. These epistles can only have their full value when viewed against their background. They exhibit an advanced Christianity, one that has a controlled leadership as well as a developed content of belief. Therefore, it is my conviction that they were written to meet the needs of their day, and that they reflect that period in history.

The historical tension and character of the Pastoral Epistles reflects the church's stand. The organization and ministry, the liturgy, the formulation of the kergyma, the ethics, and theology reflect the condition of the church at the time of the writing of these epistles. They were formed by their environment, and became a window for the development of the early church.

My objective is to relate the historical situation in the Pastorals and try to validate the fact that this situation created what is found in these letters. The epistles mirror their time, and this is what I want to demonstrate in my thesis.

My method is to show how the situation had a real impression on such things as the organization, worship, ethics and theology. Thus, I want to relate it to its time in history. The details of this are in my outline.

In other words, the need of the day changed the church and its ministry. The situation created the outcome. The author wrote to these instances. The epistles reflect a situational approach, not a formal approach, to this era of history. One can see the effects of the church's growing pains as well as its moulded organization, its Jewish-Gnostic threats from the outside as well as its theological stance from the inside.

Section One: Authenticity

Scholarly work on the Pastorals is weighted down on both sides, with conservative and liberal feelings, for and against Pauline authorship. Intense discussion since the beginning of the nineteenth century has emerged into an "immensely intricate debate."[1] Therefore, it is very important to lay down a foundation concerning the date, destination and authorship.

Thomas Aquinas[2] casually used the term 'Pastorals,' followed by Berdot,[3] "but it was not until 1726-27 that it was introduced into modern Biblical scholarship, when Paul Anton at Halle employed it in a course of lectures."[4] His lectures were on the serviceableness of the Pastorals in preparing for the ministry. In accordance with Anton's lectures the description of these letters as 'Pastorals,' won its way into general acceptance. The title troubled many, as did Pauline authorship; and both became questioned.

---

[1] J. N. D. Kelly, A Commentary of the Pastoral Epistles, (Adam and Charles Black, London, 1963), p. 27.

[2] P. N. Harrison, The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles, (Oxford University Press, London, 1921), p. 13; "The use of the word Pastoral in connection with the Epistles to Timothy and Titus goes back at least as far as Thomas Aquinas (1274), who says in his commentary (Opera, ed. Frette, Paris), 1876, p. 454, 'est haec epistola quasi pastoralis quae spectant ad reginem praelatorum;' and again in the Prologus in 2 Timothy (p. 502), 'in prima enim (epistola) instruit eum de ordinatione ecclesiastica, in hac autem secunda agit de solicitudine tanta pastorali ut etiam martyrium sustineat pro cura gregis.'"

[3] Ibid., p. 13; "In 1703 D. N. Berdot (Exercitatio Theol. exegetica in ep. L. Pauli ad Titum, Halae, p. 3f) after quoting Augustine to the effect that those destined for the ministry ought to have Paul's epistles to Timothy and Titus constantly before their eyes; 'utpote quae de Pastoris Ministerii partibus agant,' goes on to say of Titus 'in hac itaque Epistola, quae ... secundo quid et quomodo docere debeat.'"

[4] Robert Falconer, The Pastoral Epistles, (Oxford University Press, 1937), p. 1; "... on the ground that these epistles were 'the classical and supreme examples of writings serviceable to those who seek preparation for, and guidance in, the Christian ministry.'"

Because of the degree of similarity between these epistles and their common traits, they have always been considered as a group.[1] Tradition has placed the Pastorals together and we shall proceed from there in seeking date, destination and authorship of them. The intriguing strength of the Pastorals is not their cleaving together, but the ground they so firmly stand upon as individual writings. There is need to recognise that they do have differences, as well as similarities. Because of this, they open up new thought on whether or not they were written by the same person, destined for the same place,[2] and whether or not we can group them under one date or merely designate a period of history that may extend over many years. Let us consider the external data by first looking at the question of date and authorship.

The Pastorals came into use rather slowly as a recognized work of Paul. They were written to individuals, but this did not prevent them from achieving widespread circulation and official authority.[3] They were addressed to two of Paul's closest companions who were well known to the readers of the ten letters of the first Pauline corpus.[4] Timothy and Titus were considered either as children 'in the faith' (1 Timothy and Titus), or as 'beloved' children (2 Timothy).

---

[1] These books will be considered together, but there is reason for the present writer to feel they need not be studied together. The gospels present a similar situation - together they compliment each other, and yet they can be pulled apart. The same freedom should be assigned to the Pastorals. Neither the gospels nor the Pastorals were written as a series of books to be taken as a unit. Walter Lock, The Pastoral Epistles, (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1924), p. 8; "1 Timothy is entirely pastoral, and perhaps intended to be of universal application; Titus is mainly pastoral, but also a letter of commendation and a letter of recall; 2 Timothy is mainly personal, a letter or recall, and only incidently pastoral; yet all may be for many purposes treated as a unity;" and E. K. Simpson, The Pastoral Epistles, (The Tyndale Press, London, 1954), p. 2; states that "it is the common diction and outlook of these Epistles that militate fatally against any hypothesis that parts them asunder. They cleave together inextricably."

[2] A general area is presumed, not so much a specific town or place.

[3] C. K. Barrett, The Pastoral Epistles, (Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1963), p. 2.

[4] Edger J. Goodspeed, An Introduction to the New Testament, (The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1939), p. 344; "Titus is mentioned eleven times

The Pastorals were noted in the first official listing of the New Testament, in the Muratorian Canon. They were mentioned after the reference to the other Pauline letters.[1] Irenaeus thought of the Pastorals as part of the church's defence against Gnostic heresy,[2] which is probably why Marcion did not include them in his canon.[3] Some whould say Justin Martyr appears to be ignorant of the Pastorals.[4] Yet, Tertullian bears witness to their ecclesiastical discipline.[5]

(nine in 2 Corinthians, twice in Galatians), and Timothy twelve times. Timothy is also spoken of six times in Acts." James Moffatt, An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1911), pp. 412-13; disagrees and feels they are "not private or even open letters to Timotheus or Titus, but general treatises (cp. e. g. 1 Tim. 2:8) addressed to an age or a circle which was inclined to doubt the validity or to misconceive and misapply the principles of the Pauline gospel."

---

[1]Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 2; "They are mentioned in the Muratorian Canon (c. AD 200) after reference to the other Pauline letters (including Philemon but not Hebrews), as follows: 'The one (epistle) to Titus, and the two to Timothy, (were written) out of affection and love, yet have been consecrated to a position of honor in the catholic Church for the ordering of ecclesiastical discipline.' The ostensibly personal intention with which the letters were written was soon lost sight of. The author of the Muratorian Canon thinks of 'ecclesiastical discipline,' having regard no doubt, mainly to the paragraphs in the epistles dealing with the ministry;" also Lock, op. cit., p. xii; said they were separated from the other letters, as having a bearing on church life,"(Canon Mur. 'in honore tamen ecclesiae catholicae in ordinationem ecclesiasticae disciplinae sactificatae sunt.). "

[2]Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 2; Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 4; adds that even the newly discovered Gospel of Truth, makes no reference to them, yet quotes all other New Testament books. "This again is not surprising; the Gnostics generally, according to Clement and Jerome, repudiated them and their anti-Gnostic strain supplies a sufficient explanation;" also, Goodspeed, op. cit., p. 330; "Hardly a generation later, Irenaeus begins his great 'Refutation of Gnosticism' in language drawn from them."

[3]Lock, op. cit., p. xiii; also E. F. Scott, The Pastoral Epistles, (Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1936), p. xvi ; and Donald Guthrie, The Pastoral Epistles, (The Tyndale Press, London, 1957), p. 14; says that Marcion's rejection was "inspired by dogmatic considerations. Such statements as 1 Timothy 1:8, 6:20, and 2 Timothy 3:16, among others, would have cut right across Marcion's main contentions."

[4]Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 2.

[5]C. Spicq, Les Epitres Pastorales, (Etudes Bibliques, 1948), p. xxi.

Possibly the oldest external evidence for the existence of the Pastorals is to be found in the Apostolic Fathers. Whether or not these are original phrases from the Pastorals, or whether the Pastorals took from them shall be discussed.

Certain phrases in Barnabas that seem akin to phrases in the Pastorals probably belong to the common atmosphere of the church.[1] Expressions, and especially the proposition of Barnabas (xiv. 6) to Titus 2:14, have close relationships. But such traces of the Pastorals as seen in Barnabas are faint.

In Polycárp one finds passages that have a resemblance,[2] especially the two most prominent passages (1 Tim. 6:7 and 10).[3] D. W. Riddle argues that

---

[1] Moffatt, op. cit., p. 417; and F. Godet, Introduction to the New Testament, (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1894), p. 568.

[2] Alfred Wikenhauser, New Testament Introduction, (Herder and Herder, New York, 1956); states only three passages that parallel "(4, 1: 1 Timothy 6, 10 7; 9, 2: 2 Timothy 4, 10; 12, 3: 1 Timothy 2, 1 sq;" also Simpson, op. cit., p. 3; "Both Polycarp and Ignatius stigmatize love of money as the root of all ills. Possibly the saying was proverbial, but it is likelier to be a reminiscence of Timothy. For Polycarp also calls Christ our Hope, and admonishes deacons not to be slanderers or double-tongued;" also Moffatt, op. cit., p. 419; feels that the most assured traces of the Pastorals appear in Polycarp; and Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 1; "The first Christian writer who can be confidently claimed to have known the Pastorals is Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna early in the second century, who declares: 'The love of money is a source of all evils. Since then we know that we brought nothing into the world, nor have we anything to carry out ...' (Polycarp, To the Philippians iv. 1); and 'They did not love the present age (ix. 2). Cp 1 Timothy 6:10; 6:7; 2 Timothy 4:10. The sentiments in the first passage are common-place, but it is unlikely that so much of the language of the Pastorals should be reproduced by chance;" and J. D. James, The Genuineness and Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles, (Longmans, Green and Co., London, 1906), pp. 10-11; compares Ad Phil. 8 to 1 Tim. 1:1; Ad Phil. 12 to 1 Tim. 2:1, 2; Ad Phil. 5 to 1 Tim. 3:8, and says the "whole section bears a remarkable resemblance to the directions of 1 Timothy;" also Ad Phil. 4 to 1 Timothy 6:10; Ad Phil. 5 to 2 Tim. 2:12 ("it is far more likely that Polycarp is quoting from 2 Timothy 2:12 than from a fragment of a hymn on which 2 Timothy 2:12 is based; and also Ad Phil. 9 to 2 Tim. 4:9; and Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 13; says Polycarp shows a close acquaintance; also Scott, op. cit., (C), p. xxiii; feels in all probability the Pastorals quoted by Polycarp, and certainly by Justin.

[3] A. T. Hanson, The Pastoral Letters, (Cambridge at the University Press, 1966); feels Polycarp quotes 1 Timothy 6:7 and 10 in his letter, and because of these two passages immediately puts a date of 135 as the latest date that they could possibly have been written.

Polycarp (Phil. 4:1) and 1 Timothy 6:7 and 6:10 correspond in English but not in Greek.[1]

Polycarp speaks of the love of money (4:1), wives remaining faithful (4:2), widows (4:3), prayer for all men (4:3), obligations to a virtuous life (for deacons, 5:2; younger men, 5:3), presbyters' duties (6:1), refraining from false brethren (5:3), warnings against heresy (7:1), and fasting (7:2). All of these have parallels in thoughts if not in exact words with the Pastorals.

Ignatius has similarities with the Pastorals also. The author deals with the office of bishop and with the teachings in the church which seem to be Jewish.[2] Both could have parallels in the Pastorals. Other passages are noted in Ignatius and show familiarity in the Pastorals.[3] Unless a date is set for the Pastorals or Ignatius, then it is impossible to tell who took from whom.[4]

---

[1] D. W. Riddle, Early Christian Life, (Willett, Clark and Co., New York, 1936.

[2] Ibid., p. 10; "The Pastorals probably witness indirectly to the fact that the office of bishop has recently been established in the churches to which they are addressed. We may add to this that in the letters of Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, which were written about AD 110, the rule of bishops is established in Syria and Asia Minor, though not, it seems, in Philippi or Rome. But the emphatic way in which Ignatius defends the position of the bishop suggests that this new institution was still under fire. Incidentally Ignatius' career is evidence of persecution in Syria, for he wrote his seven letters while being conveyed as a condemned criminal to Rome, where he was to suffer as a martyr. Another point of contact with the time of Ignatius is the reference to Jewish teachings in the Church which occur so often in the Pastorals. Ignatius also was troubled by people who wanted to bring the Church round again to Judaism."

[3] Maurice Jones, The New Testament in the Twentieth Century, (MacMillan and Co., London, 1934), p. 280; feels that Ignatius knew the Pastorals; also Moffatt, op. cit., p. 418; "(Magn. xi = 1 Timothy 1:1; Polyk. iv. 3 = 1 Timothy 6:2; Polyk. vi. 2 = 2 Tim. 2:4; Magn. viii. 1 = 1 Tim. 4:7; Tit. 1:14, 3:9; Eph. ii. 1, cp. Smyrn. x. 2 = 2 Tim. 1:16; Eph. xiv. 1 = 1 Tim. 1:5; and Eph. xx. 1 = 1 Tim. 1:4, cp. Polyk. vi. = Tit. 1:7;" but Godet, op. cit., p. 568; says "the letters of Ignatius only present analogies of expressions.

[4] Goodspeed, op. cit., p. 344; The Pastorals being written first, Goodspeed says "the supposed use of the Pastorals in Ignatius and Polycarp must be interpreted the other way, in view of the historical situation so clearly reflected in the Pastorals themselves;" also, James, op. cit., p. 12.

Numerous phrases quoted from Clement of Rome recall phrases in the Pastorals.[1] Streeter says the verbal parallelisms are just not enough to prove literary connection, but they are enough to make it probable. His conclusion is that the Pastorals borrowed from Clement.[2] Others use the same thesis to prove that Clement borrowed from the Pastorals.[3]

Even the persecutions mentioned by Pliny may give some explanation as to date. Hanson says that since Pliny gives evidence of Christians being persecuted in Asia Minor about 112 AD, and since the Pastorals do not mention persecution, then we can assume a date earlier than 112 AD.[4] Of course Ephesus was not in Pliny's province, but it is difficult to believe that such a persecution as Pliny speaks about could be taking place without producing some kind of effect on the church in that region.

The result of the previous pages sheds light on only one aspect of dating the Pastorals. They either were familiar to the early Apostolic Fathers or vice versa. Such coincidences in spirit and phraseology as these

---

[1] Harrison, op. cit., p. 177; 1 Tim. 1:16 with Clement 42:4; 1:17 with 61:2 and 32:4; 2:3 with 7:3; 2:6 with 20:4, 20:10; 2:7 with 60:4; 2:8 with 29:1; 2:9 with 33:7; 5:17 with 1:3, 44:6; 5:21 with 21:7, 1:2; 5:24 with 51:3; 6:1 with 16:17; 6:7f with 2:2; 2 Tim. 1:3 with 45:7; 2:2 with 44:2, 63:3; 2:12 with 27:2; 2:22 with 30:1; 2:31 with 2:7; 3:5 with 53:1, 45:2f; Tit. 1:5 with 42:4; 2:5 with 1:3; 2:10 with 26:1; 2:14 with 64:1; 3:1 with 2:7, 1:3; 3:8 with 61:2.

[2] B. H. Streeter, The Primitive Church, (MacMillan and Co., London, 1930).

[3] Falconer, op. cit., p. 5; states that "the priority of the Pastorals is supported by the attitude of Clement to the ministry of the Church." Therefore, his conclusion is that the Pastorals had to be before Clement, and were therefore "inexistence not later than the beginning of the last decade of the first century;" and Simpson, op. cit., p. 3; and E. F. Brown, The Pastoral Epistles, (Methuen and Co., Ltd., London, 1917), p. xxiv; lists chapters 1, 2, 5, 21, 29, 42, 44, 45, 51, 53, 58, 60, 61; "several of these parallels would not be of much importance by themselves but cumulatively they create a strong impression that the Pastoral Epistles were known to S. Clement."

[4] Hanson, op. cit., (C), p. 8.

cannot be explained as the result of mere chance. No definite ground has been laid, except the fact of similarity or familiarity. At this point to infer a date would just be an assumption on external evidence alone. Therefore, it is most important to weigh the internal evidence which should give us more concrete evidence towards date and authorship. Serious objection to Pauline authorship grows out of the internal evidence. The criticism and debate of today did not arise in the early centuries when the Pastorals circulated under Pauline authorship.[1]

In all likelihood these epistles came from one pen. There is nothing in their internal evidence that justifies any hypothesis of a plurality of authors. Yet, they present not the personality of an author, but rather a tendency in early Christianity.[2] Objections to authenticity may be summarized under four major headings: Developed Organization; The Heresy; Theology; and Linguistics.

DEVELOPED ORGANIZATION: The Pastorals mention two distinct male offices: presbyters (sometimes referred to as episkopoi)[3] and deacons. There is also a group of organized widows and possibly even one of deaconesses.[4] The ecclesiastical position or conditions which are taken for granted in these epistles are not those of Paul's lifetime.[5]

---

[1] Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 4; "Once therefore the Pastorals had begun to circulate under the name of Paul, only a very strong contrary tradition, or a well-sustained charge of heresy, could have persuaded their readers that they were not what they appeared to be."

[2] Moffatt, op. cit., p. 414; "... like Barnabas, James, Judas and 2 Peter, they do not yield materials for determining the cast of the writers thought, and little more can fairly be deduced from their pages than the communal feeling which they voice and the general stage in the early Christian development which they mark."

[3] Wikenhauser, op. cit., p. 449; reverses this by saying that the office was of episkopi (who are also called 'presbyters' cf. Titus 1:5, 1:7."

[4] 1 Timothy 3:11 may just possibly refer to deacon's wives.

[5] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. xxii.

Only in 1 Timothy and Titus are officials even mentioned.[1] And in neither of the books is the origin of the offices mentioned. The functions are assumed and the emphasis is on the character of the individuals in the office. Their title comes from an analogy with the Jewish synagogue.[2] The author is concerned with responsible leadership, and the need of standardization in church organization is met in the Pastorals by the recognition of a stabilized ministry.

The presbyteroi (1 Tim. 5:17-21 and Tit. 1:5-6),[3] in 1 Timothy were salaried.[4] This bore on the way the church should testify its gratitude to them, if they had filled their office well. Another passage directed to them involved the manner in which they were convicted. If they were guilty of an offence, there should be a minimum of two testimonies.

The episkopos mentioned in 1 Timothy 3:1-7 and Titus 1:7-9, refers to the description of the 'presbyter.' The bishop's function was that of an overseer. Basically the words 'presbyter' and 'bishop' designate the same office.[5] There is no definite proof in the Pastorals of an monarchical episcopate, although Easton feels that in Timothy and Titus, the Ignatian bishops are basically found in everything but the title.[6] The function of

---

[1] Guthrie, op. cit., p. 25; emphasises that not only are the officials only in the two books, but also they consist of only one tenth of the subject matter, and that they deal with personnel more than the office.

[2] F. B. Clogg, An Introduction to the New Testament, (University of London Press, London, 1937), p. 117.

[3] There is question as to whether 1 Timothy 5:1 refers to "old man."

[4] William Barclay, The Letters to Timothy, Titus and Philemon, (St. Andrews Press, Edinburgh, 1956), p. 5; "From 1 Timothy 5:17, 18 we learn that by that time elders were even salaried officials. The elders that rule well are to be counted worthy of double pay, as it should be translated, and the church is urged to remember that the laborer is worthy of his hire."

[5] W. G. Kummel, Introduction to the New Testament, (Abingdon Press, Nashville, 1965), p. 268; This same office is not yet monarchical.

[6] B. S. Easton, The Pastoral Epistles, (London, 1948), p. 177; but J. McRay, "The Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles," Restoration Quarterly, (1, 1963), pp. 2-18; disagrees and feels it incorrect to say this organization is Post-Ignatius and monarchical. "The organization of the church was patterned in all probability on the synagogue with plurality of elders. Parallels with the Qumran community (B. Reicke) and parallels with the Greek city-state (E. Hatch) are rejected as unconvincing."

the 'bishop' was like that of a father to his family.[1]

The diakonos is only mentioned technically in 1 Timothy 3:8-10, 12 and 13. The characteristics of this office are similar to those of the office of bishop. The deacon seemed to be associated with the bishop; yet, his position and job in the community were different.[2] This passage describes only the requisite qualifications, and not the deacon's duties. Diakonos is also applied to Timothy (1 Tim. 4:6), and the corresponding abstract noun (diakonia) to both Paul and Timothy (1 Tim. 1:12; 2 Tim. 4:5).

Widows formed some type of group (1 Tim. 5:3-16), possibly an order.[3] Some would say this was strange to Paul, others would disagree.[4] It is certainly strange to scripture, for nowhere else is it to be found. At a later period in church history there appear traces of a regular order of widows, who acted as female servants. 1 Timothy may refer to the beginnings of such an order.[5]

Charismatics are not referred to in the Pastorals either.[6] This affirms the fact that these epistles were written partly to regulate the organization, by regulating the men. The officers were bound by an organized formula of behavior. They (presbyter, bishop, deacon, elder) were elected officials and

---

[1] Lock, op. cit., p. xx.

[2] Clogg, op. cit., p. 117; feels the deacon is of a lower grade than the bishop and the elder.

[3] Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 30; believes an order of widows is doubtful but if it does exist, it is not the first time women are used. "The reference to Phoebe as a 'deaconess' (Romans 16:1) may be a possible parallel;" but Easton, op. cit., p. 185; reminds us that the word Guthrie refers to probably denotes service in general and does not refer to a specialized order.

[4] Kummel, op. cit., p. 269; feels this is strange to Paul; and although Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 26; says that "all this passage states is that a list was to be kept on which the names of widows were enrolled if they were eligible for the churches support. The evidence is not sufficient to conclude that a distinct order was envisaged."

[5] Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 73; disagrees and says, "it cannot be said that 1 Timothy refers to such an order, though it is clear that a list of widows in the 'full sense' was kept."

the epistles are particularly concerned with their moral qualities. The first generation of leadership was charismatic, but the second generation was elected.

From these few passages that refer to organization, it is difficult to say that the whole ecclesiastical situation is later than Clement and it is certainly not as late as 150 AD.[1] Yet, to place them in the time of Paul is also illogical. There is nothing in the ecclesiastical situation revealed which encourages this.

THE HERESY: Certainly one of the basic reasons for these epistles was that some type of false teaching inconsistent with Christianity required to be countered. Warnings against present teachings were evident.[2] The false teaching is evident in all three epistles, and parallels in these epistles are also common.[3] The author was most concerned to combat the evil moral

---

[6] Wikenhauser, op. cit., p. 450; says "There is indirect evidence of the existence of charismatics in the prohibition against women speaking in the assembly of the community (1 Tim. 2:12), for this presupposes that other men besides the episcopi (1 Tim. 5:17) may speak."

---

[1] Harrison, op. cit., p. 7; says it may be accurately defined as more advanced than the state of things revealed in Clement of Rome. And Goodspeed, op. cit., p. 337; says the polity dates 150 AD, but is not fully developed and is earlier than the founding of the Catholic church.

[2] R. St. John Parry, The Pastoral Epistles, (Cambridge at the University Press, 1920), p. lxxi; reminds us that "a distinction is drawn between those warnings which deal with present conditions and those which deal with forecast of the future. To the latter class belong 1 Timothy 4:1f, and 2 Timothy 3:1f, and 4:3f."

[3] Ibid., p. lxxxi; "Common to all is the description ζητήσεις (1 Tim. 1:4, ἐκζ 6:3; 2 Tim. 2:23; Tit. 3:9) and the warning closely connected with the word ζήτησις against eristic controversy (1 Tim. 6:3; 2 Tim. 2:14; Tit. 3:9); common to 1 Timothy and Titus are descriptive words, references to law (1 Tim. 1:6; Tit. 1:4, 3:9) and to the motive of gain (1 Tim. 6:5; Tit. 1:11)."

effect of his opponents. In fact, he seemed to show their moral deficiencies, rather than to analyze their beliefs.[1]

The heresy contained Jewish elements (1 Tim. 3:9; Tit. 1:14)[2] as well as Gnostic ingredients (1 Tim. 1:4, 4:7, 6:20; 2 Tim. 2:18, 4:4; Tit. 1:14, 3:9).[3] The Gnostic element in the Pastorals is proposed by Goodspeed to represent the fully developed Gnosticism of the second century.[4] This supposition is prohibited, not only by Marcion's harsh opposition to the Old Testament and Judaism, but also by "the lack of polemic in the Pastorals against specific Marcionite views."[5] There is no specific reason to relate this Gnostic thought in these epistles with the great systems of the second century. This false teaching was reminiscent of much Greek thought which took the form of Gnosticism.[6]

---

[1] Barrett, op. cit., (C) p. 12; Lock, op. cit., p. xvii; emphasizes the ambiguity and feels the reason is because the writer is not concerned with the doctrines, as he is with the "moral tendency of the rival teachings;" also Kelly, op. cit., (C) p. 12; ". . .not so much against any specific doctrine, as against the general contentiousness and loose living it encouraged."

[2] Kummel, op. cit., p. 266; also Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 12; also F. J. A. Hort, Judaistic Christianity, (MacMillan and Co., 1894), p. 135f; and Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 33; and Kelly, (C) op. cit., p. 44, says because the fables are labelled Jewish in Titus 1:14, and while 1 Tim. 3:9, 'genealogies' are lumped with 'controversies of the law,' gives clear implication that the background is Jewish; also Lock, op. cit., p. xvii; states 2 Tim. 4:4, refers to Jewish Haggada, and 1 Tim. 6:20 to Rabbinical pride in knowledge of the law; and Hanson, op. cit., (C), p. 16, states it has many "Jewish features."

[3] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 11; and Lock, op. cit., p. xvii; says 1 Timothy 4:1-5, 2 Timothy 2:17, 3:8, 13 speak of forms which second century gnosticism took but also notes these tendencies existed in the first century (1 Cor. 15:12, Col. 2:8, Rom. 14, Heb. 13:4); and Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 13.

[4] Goodspeed, op. cit., p. 336f; says "it would be difficult to refer to Marcionism and Gnosticism more explicitly than is done in the last lines of 1 Timothy; 'Keep away from the worldly, empty phrases and contradictions (antithesis) of what they falsely call knowledge (Gnosis);'" Kummel, op. cit., p. 267; disagrees; and Wikenhauser, op. cit., p. 451; says critics have long since abandoned this theory; and Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 12; disagrees, "it was something more elementary."

[5] Kummel, op. cit., p. 267.

[6] Hanson, op. cit., (C), p. 16.

Other scholars conclude on the basis of 1 Timothy 4:3, and 2 Timothy 2:18, and their dualistic ideas, that the heretics were foreign to genuine Judaism.[1] They conclude that these false teachers proclaimed an early form of Gnosis which developed in Jewish-Hellenistic territory. Therefore, this heresy could be in Paul's time,[2] and was Jewish Gnosticism.[3]

The matter of countering the heresy was very important also. Even though this heresy could have been in Paul's time, was it confronted in the way in which Paul would have dealt with it? The Pastoral author seemed to be more concerned about combating the evil moral effect of his adversaries teaching, than in analysizing their beliefs. He wanted to show up their moral deficiencies and he did this by encouraging a life that was godly, sober, sensible and just. The most striking thing is how this false teaching was combatted. The Pastoral Epistles are in marked contrast to other Pauline epistles, such as Colossians (if it is considered Pauline). The views of the Pastoral false teachers were not refuted by confrontation, but were simply contrasted with the traditional teaching which they had fallen away from (1 Tim. 4:1, 6:20; 2 Tim. 1:14, 2:2; Tit. 3:10f). Guthrie says there cannot be a comparison between Colossians and the Pastorals, because the Colossian letter, and the Pastorals were directed to individuals.[4] But it is impossible to base this lack of theological controversy on the claim that Paul regarded the

---

[1] Wikenhauser, op. cit., p. 452-3; agrees with G. Kittel that this could be as early as Colossians 2:16, for there is evidence of a similar Gnosis in Asia Minor; also Kummel, op. cit., p. 267; observes that they correspond "exactly" with that which endangers the congregation at Colossae (also page 240).

[2] Kummel, op. cit., p. 267; Harrison, op. cit., p. 6; disagrees and states its existence was not in Paul's lifetime, "but certainly a real danger to the church half a century or so later."

[3] Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 13; and Kummel, op. cit., p. 267; and Guthrie, op. cit., (C), pp. 32-38; emphasizes that evidence is far from conclusive that the writer is, in fact, combatting developed gnosticism. "It might be maintained, with some reason, that the evidence shows an incipient form of such gnosticism, but no more than this can be claimed."

[4] Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 38.

false teaching as not worthy of refutation and presupposes that Timothy and Titus knew what was to be advanced against the false teachers.[1] Then there would be no necessity to call attention to the danger of the heresy. Would this not clearly point to the supposition that it would be difficult for Paul to be writing here?

It is suggested that if this is not Paul, then it is a lesser mind writing.[2] This assumption is very debatable. The author could very easily be a strong Paulinist with Paul's message, but could be employing a different method in order to meet the particular situation.

The heresy was counteracted by prescribing a firm foundation in the Christian faith. Error was fought by positive assertion of the genuine Christian beliefs. The author knew the heresy well enough to confront it this way.[3] The author of the Pastorals used the ideas of Paul to refute the heresy.[4] But the religious attitude toward this heresy was different from that of Paul.[5] Even Paulinists say that this point has great bearing on

---

[1] Kummel, op. cit., p. 268; "For then there would be no necessity to call the attention of the addresses to the danger of the heresy in detail;" yet Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 38; feels that "it can scarcely be assumed that the apostle had never had to deal with such false teachers while Timothy and Titus were in his company."

[2] Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 38.

[3] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. xxx; disagrees and feels "it is doubtful, indeed, whether the writer himself had any real acquaintance with the heresy which he condemns. He is content to ridicule it as 'vain babbling,' 'old wives' fables,' 'a spreading cancer,' 'make-believe knowledge.' Its teachers are accused of mercenary motives, and are compared to the Egyptian sorcerers who counterfeited the works of Moses and were put to shame. All this is in the style of the modern orator who denounces communism or spiritualism or some other delusion of the day. He has never troubled to make a study of these subjects, and in this he may show wisdom. But his invective cannot be accepted as argument."

[4] 1 Tim. 6:11-16, 3:16; 2 Tim. 1:8-10, 2:11-14; Tit. 2:11-14, 3:5-7. In fact Scott, op. cit., (C), p. xxx; feels it is the "very language of Paul. These are not perfunctory echoes of Pauline thought."

[5] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. xxxi; "... and comes out in the characteristic word eusebeia on which all the teaching of the Epistles may be said to turn. It means literally piety; but perhaps is most adequately rendered by the old word godliness. The Christian, in this writer's view, is one who

the authorship.[1] The Pastoral author did not encourage outright denunciation of the heresy as Paul did. He said that the best way to defend the faith and refute the heresy was with a 'sound doctrine' and a life of 'godliness.'

THEOLOGY: Theologically, it is easy in the Pastorals to find central thoughts of Paul.[2] On the other hand it is just as simple to encounter Hellenistic thought,[3] foreign to Paul. There is strong evidence here against Pauline authorship; yet, even the strongest critics have not been able to deny the Pauline basis.[4]

---

lives for God and carries with him, in all that he does, the consciousness of God. He is contrasted with the 'profane man' - that is, the materialist, for whom spirtual things mean nothing. When the various passages are brought together, this godliness which marks the Christian would seem to involve two things; on the one hand a right belief, on the other hand a right mode of action. In ordinary Greek the word is specially applied to that man who is careful in his observance of all the prescribed rites of religion; and it also carries something of this shade of meaning in the Pastorals. Holding the right belief, the godly man combines it with the right kind of service, both to God and to his fellow-men."

---

[1] Falconer, op. cit., p. 38.

[2] Pauline thoughts are found in Tit. 3:5 (grace by faith); ideas of eternal life (2 Tim. 1:1; Tit. 1:2, 3, 7; 1 Tim. 6:12, 1:16); God's mercy to the sinner (1 Tim. 1:1f, 2:5f); grace through Christ (2 Tim. 1:9f); also Kelly, op. cit., (C), pp. 16-17; "his attitude to such matters as second marriages (1 Tim 3:2, 12, 5:9), slaves (1 Tim. 6:1), and the state (1 Tim. 2:1f; Tit. 3:1) is of a piece with the Apostle's. The same applies to his belief that his personal sufferings will be beneficial to the elect (2 Tim. 2:10), as also to his remarks about the gentle consideration due to erring brothers (2 Tim. 2:25). It is noticeable that the characteristically Pauline formula 'in Christ' occurs seven times in 2 Timothy and twice in 1 Timothy." Yet, Kelly is the first to say that every reader should be conscious of marked differences of theological tone also; and Kummel, op. cit., p. 269; gives a list; and Scott, op. cit., (C), p. xxx; states that the writer "declares that Christ gave Himself for our redemption, that we are justified not by our own righteousness but by faith in Christ, that God called us by His grace before the world was, and that we are destined to an eternal life on which we can enter even now. These are no mere perfunctory echoes of Pauline thought."

[3] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 17; "The religious ideal is epitomized for the writer in the Hellenistic term, eusebeia, i. e. piety or godliness, which is foreign to Paul's vocabulary and thinking, and he is repeatedly calling for 'good works' in a way which has no parallel in the acknowledged

The theology of the Pastorals definitely echoes Pauline thought, but the terms are largely taken up with non-doctrinal matters.[1] The case against Pauline authorship is based on the Pastorals' stand on orthodoxy,[2] and on a 'bourgeois' Christianity, on the Hellenistic character of their language,[3] and on specific theological points where concepts are used in a way in which Paul does not use them.

First, orthodoxy was strongly stressed in the Pastorals.[4] Orthodoxy had become a necessary mark of the church, and especially of a good Christian. Michaelis says this is so because of an expanded mental range in a changing environment.[5] And Guthrie says it is not beyond Paul's ability to consider the need for conservation of doctrine.[6] Yet, such suppositions (Michaelis and Guthrie) makes Paul a syncretist.[7]

Secondly, the settled community, in which self-control and sobriety were stressed, seemed to have a 'bourgeois' attitude toward Christianity.[8] The

---

Paulines; and Kummel, op. cit., p. 269; Hellenistic terms are found in 1 Tim. 2:5, 6:15, 6:16; 2 Tim. 1:10; Tit. 2:10,2:13, 3:4,3:6.

[4] Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 39; agrees to this and states, "that even the radical Tubingen school used this fact in its attempts to create a polemical situation between Peter and Paul as background of the New Testament literature."

---

[1] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 17.

[2] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 17.

[3] Kummel, op. cit., p. 270; quotes M. Dibelius; and Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 17.

[4] Wikenhauser, op. cit., p. 448; "They alone contain the expression "sound doctrine" (ἡ ὑγιαίνουσα διδασκαλία) and other phrases with ὑγιής and ὑγιαίνειν . (1 Tim. 1:10; 2 Tim. 4:3; Tit. 1:9, 2:1 - 1 Tim. 6:3; 2 Tim. 1:13; Tit. 2:8 - Tit. 1:13 2:2)."

[5] W. Michaelis, "Past. und Wortstatistik," Zeitschrift fur die ntl. Wissenschaft und die Kunde der alteren Kirche, 28, 1929, pp. 69f.

[6] Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 40, and 45; in which he states, "the use of sterotyped phraseology would have been much more probable in letters directed to close personal associates than to mixed communities."

[7] Kummel, op. cit., p. 269.

[8] Again, the term eusebeia is used in defence of this thought. This is foreign to Paul, says Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 17.

language was Hellenistic. The religious ideal was epitomized in the Hellenistic term eusebeia, which was foreign to Paul. The author repeatedly called for 'good works,' in a way which has no Pauline parallel. A difference is apparent between the religion of the Pastorals and that of Paul.[1]

Thirdly, and probably most important, are the specific theological terms. The absence of Pauline doctrine is noted. For instance the cross no longer holds a central position, and nothing is said about the conflict between the flesh and the spirit.[2] Paul's emphasis on the contrast between Law and grace is missing also. However, far more important than any conjecture thus far are the theological terms, which are used differently. The word pistis appears in the Pastorals thirty-three times.[3] 'Faith and action' are inseparable in Paul,[4] yet, in the Pastorals, this is not totally true. Paul's full use of 'faith' is missing is these epistles.[5] 'Faith' for Paul denoted a quality of abiding trust and had passed beyond the root meaning of 'fidelity.'[6]

---

[1]Scott, op. cit., (C), p. xxxi; "Religion, therefore, as this writer understands it, consists of two elements, which are themselves separate although in the true Christian they are joined together."

[2]Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 18. Though he gives evidence against Pauline authorship, his stand is for Pauline authorship.

[3]Parry, op. cit., p. civ; "The cases of its occurrence may be classified 1) anarthorus, a) ἐν πίστει, b) other instances, 2) with the article."

[4]Scott, op. cit., (C), p. xxxi; "In the teaching of Paul (and this is likewise true of Jesus' own teaching), faith and action are inseparable. The good life is nothing but the 'fruit' the natural outcome of faith. Through this new relation to God the will of God takes possession of the believer, and he acts by it almost without his knowing."

[5]Easton, op. cit., p. 103; says that the "full Pauline use of 'faith' as the justifying principle is absent from the Pastorals; and Scott, op. cit., (C), emphasises the difference in the Pastorals - "faith is not so much a root as a foundation (cf. 1 Tim. 3:15, 6:19) - the necessary basis of all right living, though it does not of itself produce it;" Yet, Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 42; states "it is true that faith is not mentioned in the key passage on justification (Tit. 3:5-7), but we cannot assume that such faith is excluded." But he still concludes that if one takes the evidence as a whole, the use of pistis cannot be "considered an insuperable obstacle to authenticity even though some aspects of Paul's earlier use are missing."

[6]Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 42.

But, faith in the Pastorals is not self-commitment to Christ, such as an "abiding trust," but is another virtue or an accepted belief of the church which is objectively understood.[1]

The objective use of the term 'faith,' with the article is a partial explanation of the difference from Paul;[2] however, this occurs on only nine of the thirty-three times that 'faith' is mentioned.[3] These occurrences are in 1 Timothy 1:19, 3:9, 4:1, 4:6, 5:8, 6:10, 12, 21, and 2 Timothy 3:8. 'Faith' as used in the Pastorals is no longer an inward experience as it was for Paul, for it has become "the faith."[4] 'Faith' has become a set of beliefs and principles to be carried on, and the Pastoral author confused Pauline 'faith' with loyalty, to a church tradition.[5]

'Grace' underwent a similar change. The apostle felt that 'grace' was a free gift from God, and could not be earned or won.[6] 'Grace' in the Pastorals is not the transforming power that it was for Paul,[7] but is rather a helping hand which allows co-operation from man (Tit. 2:11). Salvation is still the grace

---

[1] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 18. Note addition to footnote 2, p. 16.

[2] Easton, op. cit., p. 203; and J. Jeremias, Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus, (Gottingen, 1934), p. 4; considers that the stress on faith-teaching as a fixed norm is explained by the writers preoccupation with the heresy conflict.

[3] Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 42; feels this to be a poor argument and feels it presents no difficulty when "Pauline parallels such as Phil. 1:20, Col. 2:7, Ephesians 4:5, etc. are borne in mind." The difficulty is that of the three epistles Guthrie lists, only Philippians is considered genuine Pauline by many scholars.

[4] Goodspeed, op. cit., p. 335.

[5] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. xxi; and Kummel, op. cit., p. 270.

[6] Romans 5:15; "But the free gift is not like the trespass. For if many died through one man's trespass, much more have the grace of God and the free gift in the grace of that one man Jesus Christ abounded for many." (RSV)

[7] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 18. Note addition to footnote 2, p. 16.

of God in the Pastorals;[1] yet, there is a needed response from man. A. M. Hunter feels Romans 9-10 allows for human response.[2]

The Pastoral author's conception of Christ was that He was both human and divine.[3] Jesus was considered as the Mediator and never called Jesus or Christ.[4] He was called "Christ Jesus almost always, Jesus Christ rarely, never Jesus alone."[5] The author's description of Christ as Savior and his references to His manifestation "recall the Hellenistic cultus rather than the apostle's idiom and thought."[6]

---

[1]Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 22; notes however that there are passages "where the author comes near to contradicting himself. It is probably only just to say that in what might appear his Pelagian passages the author has been impelled by excess of zeal for the moral consequences of faith to overstress the ethical element in Christian life;" yet, Scott, op. cit., (C), p. xxxi; would say that even though the salvation is a free gift of God, "he allows for a co-operation on the part of men. He describes grace as acting by a process of education." *

[2]A. M. Hunter, The Gospel According to St. Paul, (SCM Press, London), p. 74.

[3]Human - 1 Tim. 2:5 (also possibly 1 Tim. 6:13, and 2 Tim. 2:8). Divine - 1 Tim. 1:2, 12, 14, 6:14; 2 Tim. 1:8, 16, 18, 2:7, 3:11, 4:8, 14, 22. Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 24; reminds us that in some of these passages it is not certain whether the word applies to Jesus Christ or God the Father.

[4]1 Timothy 2:5; "For there is one God, and there is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 25; reminds us that "by Mediator the Pastorals do not mean a 'tertium quid,' half God and half man, but one who truly was man, and by his obedient and sacrificial life and death as man reconciled God and his creatures. He was not a Prometheus, not an angel, not a gnostic revealer, and not a divine man; but man and God, the man in whom the divisive effect of sin was removed so that deity and humanity might be one;" and Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 18; says the term 'Mediator' is only used by Paul when referring to Moses (Gal. 3:19).

[5]Lock, op. cit., p. xxi; "... 'Christ Jesus' almost always, 'Jesus Christ' rarely, never 'Jesus' alone or 'Christ' alone - but the Messiah as one with God in His universal love and work;" and Harrison, op. cit., 57; "Paul uses 'Jesus' alone at least thirty-eight times, and in every epistle except Philemon; Christos alone and without the article one hundred twenty six times, and in every epistle except 2 Thess., and Christos seventy-nine times, and in every epistle execpt Philemon."

[6]Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 18; (references to Savior are 2 Timothy 1:10 and Titus 2:13, 3:16).

* Kummel, op. cit., p. 269; says we encounter Hellenistic terms for the event of salvation which would be strange to Paul.

The union between the believer and Christ that Paul stressed in his authentic epistles, through using the phrase 'in Christ,' is lacking in a mystical sense in the Pastorals.[1] The author mainly thought of him as the risen Lord and the Mediator. Also, the Pastorals seldom refer to the death and exaltation of Christ as compared with the genuine Paulines.[2]

The Holy Spirit is seldom mentioned or alluded to in the Pastorals. He is mentioned three definite times (1 Tim. 4:1; 2 Tim. 1:14; Tit. 3:5),[3] and possibly a fourth.[4] The lack of mention of the Holy Spirit is not Pauline.[5] In the Pastorals, the Holy Spirit receives only "perfunctory mention."[6] The paradox of Christian existence is still grasped, even though

---

[1]Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 41; feels differently and says: "The phrase 'in Christ,' so characteristic of Paul, occurs seven times in 2 Timothy (1:1, 9, 13, 2:10, 3:12, 15) and twice in 1 Timothy (1:14, 3:13);" and Easton, op. cit., pp. 210-11; says that none of the cases mentioned by Guthrie have a mystical sense. Guthrie (p. 41) strongly disagrees and states that "for where qualities are spoken of as 'in Christ,' more is surely intended than merely 'Christian.' It is difficult to see any difference of approach between 2 Timothy 1:13, 'in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus,' and Colossians 1:4, 'your faith in Christ Jesus.' Moreover if 'in Christ' is generally a synonym for 'Christian' in the Pastorals, it must be considered in the same way in certain Pauline usages." Yet, Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 18; reiterates the fact that this mystical union is scarcely present at all.

[2]Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 25.

[3]1 Timothy 4:1 - becomes the source of inspiration of the Christian prophets. 2 Timothy 1:14 - "the indwelling power which enables them to be loyal to their trust." (Lock, op. cit., p. xxii.). And Titus 3:5 - is referred to as a source of mysterious power which renews a person at baptism. Easton, op. cit., p. 234; feels the reference in 2 Timothy and Titus, as citations, and 1 Timothy's as conventional language when citing prophecy; but Guthrie, op. cit., (C), says this is begging the question.

[4]Lock, op. cit., p. xxii; There may be a reference in 1 Timothy 3:16 as the inspirer of Christ's perfect life.

[5]Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 42; reminds us that the spread is not even in other Pauline material. He cites 2 Thessalonians, Colossians, and Philemon, where it is only referred to once in the first two and none in the latter. (Again, we need to consider if these are Pauline epistles). And Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 24; feels this is a strong argument against Pauline authorship.

[6]Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 18; Note addition to footnote 2, p. 16.

the Holy Spirit does not play a prominent role.[1]

The idea of God in the Pastorals is similar to that found in the Old Testament,[2] though some say it is partially Hellenistic.[3] God is considered rather remote,[4] and unapproachable.[5] Verses such as 1 Timothy 1:17, and 6:15-16, exemplify this.[6] Paul's conception of God as the loving Father is missing.[7] The idea of God in the Pastorals is colored by Jewish and Hellenistic ideas of remoteness.

One of the points in which the Pastorals differ "most markedly" with the acknowledged Pauline letters is in their use of eusebeia.[8] This whole concept was foreign to Paul's theology.[9]

---

[1] Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, vol. 2, (SCM Press, London, 1955), p. 185; although Easton, op. cit.,, p. 22; states the doctrine of the Holy Spirit meant little to this author.

[2] Lock, op. cit., p. xxi; "... with the sense of His Fatherhood deepened by the revelation of Christ, and with more abstract qualities emphasized, perhaps through the influence of Greek philosophy upon Jewish thought;" and Easton, op. cit., p. 166; terms used as epithets for God which are Judaistic - ('Potentate,' 2 Macc. 12:15; 'King of Kings and Lord of lords,' Ex. 26:7 - 2 Macc. 13:4; 'unapproachable light,' Enoch 12:15f); and Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 18.

[3] Easton, op. cit., p. 166; Terms such as 'immortal' and 'invisible' are Hellenistic; and Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 18.

[4] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 18; and Easton, op. cit., p. 166; yet Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 40; says we cannot maintain remoteness in all cases because of two passages (1 Tim. 1:17, 6:15-6).

[5] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 18.

[6] Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 40; says this is not the situation in every case though.

[7] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 18.

[8] A. T. Hanson, Studies in the Pastorals Epistles, (SPCK, London, 1968), p. 23; "Of the four cognates eusebeia, eusebein, eusebes, and eusebos, not one occurs anywhere in the New Testament except in Acts, 2 Peter and the Pastoral Epistles. Eusebia occurs ten times in the Pastorals, eusebein once, and eusebos once. The noun is a favorite of the author of the Pastorals;" W.F. Moulton + A.S. Geden, A Concordance of the Greek New Testament, (T+T Clark, Edinburgh) 1963, p464

[9] Falconer, op. cit., p. 37; When speaking about Paul he states "we miss his devotion to His Lord, and he is rejoicing in fellowship with Him in the Holy Spirit. Eusebeia expresses itself in worship of the ascended, triumphant Christ. It does not spring from the vivid mystical experience of the Risen Christ, who is present and united with the believer through faith, but is supported by the historical facts of redemption as they have been accepted in church tradition."

Theologically, the semantical problem that exists becomes apparent; but linguistically, the non-Paulinists find even more fertile ground. Neither the style, vocabulary nor the actual thought of the author can be described as distinctively Pauline.[1]

LINGUISTICS: Holtzmann[2] and Harrison[3] demonstrated in their books the great difference between the language of the Pastorals and the other Paulines. Metzger concludes that because of the shortness of the Pastorals, language cannot be considered a serious objection.[4] But when the Greek text is examined, it is revealing to see the number of differences, both in grammar and in vocabulary. The peculiarities of diction are not confined to the treatment of matters which now presented themselves for the first time.[5] The differences between these epistles and the unquestioned Pauline epistles suggest two periods of history as well as different authors. Yet, some say this is not conclusive evidence.[6]

---

[1] Moffatt, op. cit., p. 406; states this occurs because the writer was composing in Paul's name. "The significant feature of the terminology, as of the thought, is its difference from Paul's. The similarities are neither numerous nor so primary as the variations, and the latter point to a writer who betrays the later milieu of his period in expression as well as in conception. Also Th. Nageli, Der Wortschatz des Apostels Paulus, 1905, p. 85f; admits that the linguistic phenomena are adverse to the Pauline authorship of any of the canonical epistles.

[2] H. J. Holtzmann, Die Pastoralbriefe, (Leipzig, 1880).

[3] Harrison, op. cit.; Kummel , op. cit., p. 262; states that Michaelis disputed with Harrison because he "compared the vocabulary of individual pages with one another instead of entire epistles."

[4] B. M. Metzger, "A Reconsideration of Certain Arguments Against Pauline Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles," Expository Times, (70), 1958-59, pp. 67f.

[5] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. xxi.

[6] Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 47; agrees there are many differences between these epistles and the other ten Pauline epistles, "but these differences are not uniform and cannot be held as conclusive evidence of non-Pauline authorship. Questions of authorship cannot be decided on numerical data without reference to psychological probability;" and Parry, op. cit., p. cxiv-cxv; "... It is quite obvious that a document which treats officials of the church or the characteristics of a special group of teachers will employ a largely different vocabulary from one which deals with the relations of Jew and Gentile within the Church, or of the difficulties of social intercourse with the heathen."

The basic structure of the letters, such as clauses, sentences, short paragraphs, and length is typically Pauline. But, the style of the Pastorals is not typically Pauline.[1] The statistical method confirms this,[2] and in addition "has shown that the ratio of the logarithums of vocabulary and text length in the Pastorals diverges considerably from the same ratio in the epistles as a whole (including Colossians, Ephesians, and 2 Thessalonians)."[3] Also the ratio of Greek and Semitic conditional sentences, provides statistics in favor of non-Pauline authorship.[4]

There is a smooth flowing diction and rhythm in the Pastorals.[5] However, there is an absence of outbursts of the feeling and warmth found in Paul.[6] Instruction replaces argument for the Pastoral author.[7] And, the

---

[1] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 21; There is a lack of the "apostles' vigor and variety; he writes smooth, often monotonous sentences, instead of piling up parentheses and anacolutha in the struggle to bring his truths to birth;" and Hanson, op. cit., (C), p. 2. Note addition to footnote 2, p. 11e.

[2] K. Grayston and G. Herdon, "The Authorship of the Pastorals in the Light of Statistical Linguistics," New Testament Studies, (October, 1959), p. 1: "If ever a writer was in the grip of his own words, it was Paul, and that makes it highly improbable that he should change his style at will, and according to circumstances." Both agree that the statistics give us proof.

[3] Kummel, op. cit., p. 262.

[4] K. Beyer, Semitische Syntax im New Testament, vol. 1, (1962), pp. 232, 295, 298.

[5] Falconer, op. cit., p. 8; "We miss the vigor of Paul's style in his great epistles. The fullness of his thought does not entangle the writer in his words, he does not pass quickly from image to image, except in 2 Timothy 2:3-6, or pursue parallel trains of thought; and on rhythm, H. J. Rose, "The Clausulae of the Pauline Corpus," Journal of Theological Studies, (October, 1923, vol. 25), p. 31f; "On rhythmical ground alone 1 Timothy is non-Pauline." 2 Timothy is genuine, but "edited for publication after the writers death." And Titus "is too short a work to give any very decided results;" and Moffatt, op. cit., p. 407.

[6] Hanson, op. cit., (C), p. 2; "... less enthusiastic, less fiery, less emphatic;" and Falconer, op. cit., p. 8; reminds us it cannot be explained by old age, "for in Philippians, if as is probable it was written from Rome, the fire is bright, the spirit strong;" Nor can it be explained by the character of the subject (except for 1 Timothy possibly), "for they do not differ essentially from those in 1 Corinthians, or the last five chapters of Romans;" and Moffatt, op. cit., p. 407; "The Pauline impetuousness and incisiveness is missing."

[7] Wickenhauser, op. cit., p. 447; "There is hardly anything that can be called deduction or demonstration; in place of logical argument there is simply assertion and instruction."

heaping up of epithets says something more than Paul.[1]

The syntax is stiffer and more regular in the Pastorals.[2] There are Pauline echoes, "but anacoloutha and paronomasia are not specifically made by the style as a whole."[3] There are not so many instances of anacolouthon, or grammatical discord, or syntactical peculiarities as in the genuine Pauline letters.

The Pastoral author was concerned about keeping intact the correct pattern of sound words, "which must be diligently memorized and faithfully recited, and so passed on from lip to lip as the one duly authorized expression of saving truth."[4] The style definitely has its differences from other genuine Pauline material.[5] Wikenhauser says it is because of different subject matter and circumstances;[6] yet, this is a poor explanation according to Moffatt.[7]

Even as early as 1807, the authenticity of 1 Timothy was doubted on

---

[1] Moffatt, op. cit., p. 407.

[2] J. B. Lightfoot, Biblical Essays, (MacMillan and Co., London, 1893), p. 402. "It is stiffer and more regular than in the earlier epistles, more jointed and less flowing. The clauses are marshalled together, and there is a tendency to parallelism. There is a greater sententiousness, an abruptness and positiveness in form. Imperative clauses are frequent."

[3] Moffatt, op. cit., p. 407; yet Lock, op. cit., p. xxviii; says they are more than echoes if one compares, "as it ought to be compared, not with either the argumentive parts of previous letters (Rom. 1-9, Gal.), or the parts written under strong personal provocation (2 Cor. 1-7, 10-13), but with the more quiet practical sections (Rom. 10-15, Col. 8-9). There is the same basing upon doctrine, the same personal touches with references to a similar fondness for adapting Old Testament language, a similar use of Rabbinical Haggada and of quotations from classical writers, the same love of oxymoron, the same play on a word and its cognates, the same 'Hellenistic' idiom rather than that of literary Greek."

[4] Harrison, op. cit., p. 42; "Such with him is the sacred deposit to be handed on from one generation of accredited teachers to another."

[5] Lock, op. cit., p. xxvii; diaagress and says: this style "is more like that of Paul than that of any other New Testament writer."

[6] Wikenhauser, op. cit., p. 446.

[7] Moffatt, op. cit., p. 408.

linguistic grounds.[1] This is because of a great array of hapax legomena.[2] These words that are foreign to the New Testament and Pauline usage are an essential part of the evidence on which the final decision must inevitably be based.[3]

The vocabulary of the Pastorals shows that over thirty-six per cent of the words, not counting proper names, are not found in any of the remaining ten Paulines.[4] The hapax legomena consisted of a hundred and seventy five words, or an average of more than fourteen per cent per page.[5]

There are a great number of words in the Pastorals and in other New Testament writings that do not appear in the Pauline epistles.[6] The

---

[1] Harrison, op. cit., p. 18; says Schleiermacher found many linguistic peculiarities in 1 Timothy; and Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 46.

[2] Harrison, op. cit., p. 18; says in Schleiermacher's Sendschreiben an Gass, (p. 28), that he offered us a dry list of words.

[3] Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 47; does not feel these differences are uniform, and states that they cannot be held as conclusive evidence of non-Pauline authorship. Such an approach would not only rule out some other Pauline letters but would imply the impossibility of any change in an author's style or language, and this position cannot be maintained."

[4] Harrison, op. cit., p. 20; "The vocabulary of the Pastorals consists of some 902 words, of which 54 are proper names. Of the remaining 848, 306 or over 36 per cent are not found in any one of the ten Paulines;" and Hanson, op. cit., (C), p. 2; emphasizes words such as eusebeia and the title soter, and Dynast - the latter two found between the Old Testament and the New Testament, and in the earliest Christian writings, but not Paul.

[5] W. P. Workman, "The Hapax Legomena of St. Paul," Expository Times, (vii, 1896), pp. 418-19; first created discussion here; and Harrison, op. cit., pp. 20-21; (1 Tim. has 96 or 15.2 per cent per page; 2 Tim. has 60 or 12.9 per cent per page and Tit. has 43 or 16.1 per cent per page). Harrison also gives a parallel to other Pauline letters (Rom. 4; 1 Cor. 4:1; 2 Cor. 5:6; Gal. 3:9; Eph. 4:6 Phil. 6:2; Col. 5:5 1 Thess. 3:6; 2 Thess. 3:3; and Philemon 4 per page). The conclusion is that 1 Timothy has an increase of at least 9 per page, 2 Timothy 6.7 per cent, and Titus 9.9 per cent per page over the other epistles; yet Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 213; says this has little value, "for the greater the number of extant writings with which comparison is made, the greater is the probability that unusual words will be duplicated. In short, literary art cannot be reduced to a mathematical equation;" and M. Dibelius, Die Pastoralbrief, (Handbuch zum Neuem Testament), (Tubingen, 3rd edition, revised by Hans Conzelmann, 1955), p. 3; "Diese statistische Methode zur Bestreitung der Echtheit nicht ausreicht."

[6] Harrison, op. cit., p. 21.

conclusion is that the Pastorals stand right outside the Paulines, and form a distinct group of their own. This creates serious doubts concerning their common authorship. Yet, the parallel with the Apostolic Fathers and Apologists concerning the hapaxes is doubtful.[1]

There are words found in the Pastorals and also in Paul that are similar.[2] Professor Findlay adds to this the reappearance of "characteristic mannerisms" of the apostle Paul in these epistles.[3] But, there is no "counter-weight" here to set against the great mass of facts which are against Pauline authorship.

The missing particles, enclitics, prepositions and pronouns that Paul frequently used present a serious problem.[4] Characteristic words such as ἄρα, ἄρτι, διότι, εἴτε, ἐπεί, ἰδού, καθάπερ, νυνί, δέ, οὐχί, ὥστε, are missing as is the preposition σύν, which plays an important role

---

[1] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 24; "First it has been shown that almost exactly the same proportion of the hapaxes to be found, for example, in such an undoubted epistle as 1 Corinthians occur in these very same writers. Secondly, the proportion in question, 93 out of 175 (going by Harrison's figures), hardly suggests, even if taken at its face value, that the author's vocabulary was distinctively second century. Thirdly, and more devastatingly, it has been pointed out that almost all the hapaxes in the Pastorals (on this estimate, 153 out of 175) were in use by Greek writers prior to AD 150. There is clearly nothing in the vocabulary alone which demands a second-century date for the letters;" and Guthrie, op. cit., (C), pp. 214-15; and M. Hitchcock, "Tests for the Pastorals," Journal of Theological Studies, (xxx, 1929), p. 278; says all but 28 of these non-Pauline words were known before 50 AD.

[2] Harrison, op. cit., p. 24, "The total number of words shared by the Pastorals with one or more of the ten Paulines is 542." 50 are exclusively Pauline (they do not appear elsewhere in the New Testament). Of this 50 only 7 occur in more than one of the Pastorals and only one occurs in all three of them.

[3] G. G. Findlay, The Epistles of the Apostle Paul, (C. H. Kelly, London,) p.212.

[4] Barclay, op. cit., (C), p. 12; "Greek is a language which has many more little words which are called particles and enclitics than English has. Sometimes they indicate a tone of voice more than anything else. Every Greek sentence is joined to the sentence which goes before, and these little untranslatable words are the joins. Of these particles, enclitics, pronouns, and prepositions there are 112 in Paul's other letters, which he uses altogether 932 times, and they never occur in the Pastorals."

in Paul's thought and vocabulary.[1]

The absence of many characteristic uses of the article is strange to Paul's style. For instance, in the author's use of the definite article, he betrays a noticeably different method of literary craftsmanship.[2] And even more significant is the use of different words for the same things.[3] Also there are repeated appearances of phrases which are not found in Paul.[4] Statistics confirm that these epistles are more sparing in their use of Septuagint words, and more lavish in Hellenistic words, than the genuine Pauline letters.[5] Jeremias says that when the epistles are compared to Paul's general usage, the vocabulary of them shows a close contact with the educated everyday language of the Hellenistic world, and with the language of the

---

[1] Kummel, op. cit., p. 263; and Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 6, says this may be suggestive; yet, Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 224, suggests that Harrison is wrong in assuming that all that "Paul ever wrote must be restricted to the ten Paulines." He continues to say that of the "112 particles, etc., 58 occur in only one or two epistles and cannot therefore be considered a major obstacle. Of the rest, 24 occur in 5 or more epistles and 30 in 3 or 4, and these two groups might reasonably be claimed as characteristic of the apostle's style;" also D. Guthrie, The Pastoral Epistles and the Mind of Paul, (London, 1956), Appendix E, 41-44; adds to this by stating that Harrison does not show some 93 additional particles, pronouns and prepositional forms, "of which all but one are found in the Pastorals and all but eight in the other Pauline group;" yet Harrison, op. cit., p. 38, says it is not possible to "redress the balance by referring to the 77 Pauline particles, etc., which do appear in the Pastorals. For of these--- a) Every one occurs also in the Apostolic Fathers, and in the Apologists, and the great majority in practically every book of the New Testament. b) 36 occur in all three Pastorals, of which all occur in Romans, all but one in 1 a 2 Cor., Eph., Phil., Gal., 33 in Col., 30 in 1 Thess., 31 in 2 Thess., and 30 even in Philemon. c) Of the remaining 41, 7 occur in only one Pauline, 17 in only one of the Pastorals, and 10 only once in the Pastorals;" yet Parry, op. cit., p. cxviii, reminds us that if vocabulary alone is taken, there is such a difference in all the epistles that it might point to separate authorship of each epistle.

[2] Harrison, op. cit., p. 38f; but Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 226-7; disagrees and gives reasons.

[3] Kummel, op. cit., p. 263.

[4] Kummel, op. cit., p. 263.

[5] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 23.

Hellenistic-Jewish wisdom teaching.[1] More than anything else the vocabulary of these epistles constitutes an argument against Pauline authority.

The destination of the epistles is not exactly clear. 1 Timothy 1:3 tells us that the writer "urged" Timothy to "remain at Ephesus." 2 Timothy 1:15 states: "you are aware that all who are in Asia turned away from me . . ." Also in 2 Timothy 1:18,[2] there is a reference to Ephesus. The letter to Titus refers to Crete, and in Titus 1:12, the author speaks of the false prophets who are talking about Cretans.[3]

To assume Ephesus and Crete as the destination of the epistles can not be too far wrong.[4] It would be best to say that the destination is Asia Minor. When studying the environment of Ephesus and Crete during the first and second century and the background of the Pastorals, a parallel can be drawn to this area of Asia Minor.

The historical allusions created problems in regard to authorship.[5] The question is, can this data[6] fit into Paul's life as recorded in Acts?

It is doubtful whether the Caesarean imprisonment can be linked with the Pastoral epistles.[7] The hypothesis of an Ephesian imprisonment,

---

[1] Wikenhauser, op. cit., p. 447; quotes Jeremias.

[2] 2 Timothy 1:18, ". . . may the Lord grant him to find mercy from the Lord on that Day--and you well know all the service he rendered at Ephesus."

[3] Titus 1:12, "One of themselves, a prophet of their own, said, 'Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, lazy gluttons."

[4] Wikenhauser, op. cit., p. 438; and Kummel, op. cit., p. 260.

[5] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. xvi, xvii, says Paul cannot be the author when we examine the historical framework of the letters.

[6] 1 Timothy 1:3; 2 Timothy 1:17, 1:16, 1:8, 4:16, 4:13, 4:20; and Titus 1:5, 3:12. Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 17f, summarizes the feelings about this historical data, and whether it can fit into Paul's life as recorded in Acts. He looks at three imprisonments (Caesarea, Rome, and recent year scholars have postulated an Ephesian imprisonment.)

[7] Moffatt, op. cit., pp. 403-4, summarizes the thought of Hitzig (Ueber Johannes Marcus, 1843, p. 154f); Bacon (Story of St. Paul, p. 196f.), Clemen (Paulus, p. 405f); and Max Krenkel, Beitrage zur Aufhellsing der Gerchichte und der Briefe des Apostle Paulus, (Braunschw, 1890), pp. 395-468; and Guthrie, op. cit. (C), p. 17, "is regarded as an interpolation or a corruption, for either of which the slightest MS evidence exists, the attempt to link the Pastorals as a whole to the Caesarean imprisonment must be abandoned."

proposed by Duncan,[1] has its difficulties also.[2] In fact, even Duncan admits his approach to these epistles is "wholly tentative."[3] The Roman imprisonment mentioned at the end of Acts tries to separate the epistles.[4] However, no one favors this separation. Therefore, the historical allusions fail to fit in the Acts account.

Other solutions are to be considered.[5] The two which have the most merit are the "Second Imprisonment Hypothesis" and the "Fragment Hypothesis." However, at one time the "Fictitious Hypothesis,"[6] and the "Partition-Theory" were considered.[7]

Because of the silence of Acts about the latter part of Paul's life,

---

[1] G. S. Duncan, St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry, (Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1929), pp. 184, 216.

[2] P. N. Harrison, "The Pastoral Epistles and Duncan's Ephesian Ministry," New Testament Studies, (May, 1956), pp. 250-261; also Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 18; says it raises too many problems.

[3] G. S. Duncan, "St. Paul's Ministry in Asia - the Last Phase," New Testament Studies, (May, 1957), pp. 217-8; but Harrison, op. cit., (NTS), pp. 250f; criticizes Duncan's porposals mainly on the grounds of the "inherent contradictions" of 2 Timothy 4.

[4] Vernon Bartlet, The Expositor, Series VIII, vol. 5, 1913; pp. 28-36, 161-167, 256-263, 325-347; maintains that 1 Timothy was sent after Paul left Ephesus and that Titus was left at Crete after Paul's visit to Fair Havens.

[5] The "Fictitious Hypothesis," regards all the personalia as fictitious devices to provide an appearance of authenticity; the "Second Imprisonment Hypothesis," which assumes that Paul continued where Acts stops; and the "Fragment Hypothesis," which gives certain personalia as Pauline, fitting them into widely differing situations in the Acts history.

[6] The strongest advocate was Holtzmann, op. cit., p. 125; yet, even though he states that whoever wrote these in Paul's name "was bound in the nature of things to do what he could to render the fiction as convincing as possible. The analogy of the genuine epistles was bound to suggest to him a certain quantum of personal notices." Yet, Harrison, op. cit., p. 102; voices the feeling of many - "We conclude therefore that modern scholarship is right in refusing with one voice, though for a variety of reasons, to regard these Personalia as pure fiction invented by the 'auctor ad Timotheum et Titum' in order to lend verisimilitude to the rest of his handiwork."

[7] Moffatt, op. cit., p. 403f; analyses the presumably authentic material and summarizes Von Soden's, McGiffert's, Laughlin's and Hausrath's theories.

much speculation occurs concerning a second Roman imprisonment. The second Imprisonment Hypothesis states that Paul continued on a missionary journey after the first Roman imprisonment, and was later imprisoned again.[1] The evidence of Eusebius is taken to support this theory,[2] but it is considered by some as popular exegesis.[3] The absence of concrete evidence make it difficult to come to any definite conclusions concerning this hypothesis.[4]

The Fragment Hypothesis says there are enough personal messages in the Pastorals to make them appear as genuine Pauline letters. This is done by personalia which they contain. This hypothesis gains support by references to the local conditions,[5] and by the moving personal passages found in 2 Timothy.

Harrison is the principal exponent of the Fragment Hypothesis, and he feels the positive conclusion is that a devout Paulinist wrote these letters. He says the author had access to Paul's ten letters and several brief notices

---

[1]Harrison, op. cit., p. 6; says this must be dismissed as a legend without valid historical basis.

[2]Kirsop Lake, Eusebius (Ecc. Hist.), vol. 1, (William Heinemann, London, 1926), p. 165f; states Paul was taken to Rome as a prisoner. "Tradition has it that after defending himself the apostle was again sent on the ministry of preaching, and coming a second time to the same city suffered martyrdom under Nero. During the imprisonment ... "

[3]Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 21; and Harrison, op. cit., p. 103; says Eusebius "preserved many a priceless record of historic fact, ... but also many a baseless legend."

[4]Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 21; "The absence of any specific early attestation cannot of itself render the hypothesis untenable, while the absence of any contrary evidence leaves a possibility of release."

[5]Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 32; "Examples of these are the mention of the downfall of Hymenaeus and Alexander (1 Tim. 1:20), the dark references to 'certain persons' who cause trouble (1 Tim. 1:3, 6:18, 6:10, 6:21), and the hints that the heresy had a markedly Jewish coloring at Crete while the church organization there was more embryonic."

written by the apostle.[1] However, this supposition has met with opposition.[2] Each theory has loopholes; but, the Fragment Hypothesis seems most logical.

Therefore, the present writer has come to the following conclusions:

a) The whole ecclesiastical situation presupposed in these epistles represents a development later than that of Paul and the apostolic age.

b) The false teaching could have been during Paul's lifetime, but definitely was a real danger to the church a generation or two later. The way the heresy is attacked certainly is post-Pauline.

c) Central theological thoughts of Paul are evident in these epistles, but the meaning has changed. Hellenistic thought foreign to Paul is quite evident.

d) Linguistic statistics tell heavily against Pauline authorship, as does the style. Even more decisive is the lack of vocabulary characteristic of true Paulinism.

e) The comparison of the language of the Pastorals with the contemporary writers of the late first and early second century shows that they are similar. This may indicate a closeness of the writers in style or a relationship that each had with one another (pp. 4, 5, 6).

f) The destination of the epistles is Asia Minor.

g) The epistles fail to fit into the Acts account of the history of the apostle Paul.

---

[1] Harrison, op. cit., pp. 8f, and 115f; The fragments are as follows: 1) Tit. 3:12-15, (from Macedonia to Titus); 2) 2 Tim. 4:13-15, 20, 21a, (from Macedonia to Timothy); 3) 2 Tim. 4:16-18a, (from Caesarea); 4) 2 Tim. 4:9-12, 22b, (Paul is in Rome); 5) 2 Tim. 1:16-18, 3:10, 11; 4:1, 2a, 5b-8, 18b, 19, 21b-22a, (Paul's last letter-fragments). Later Harrison, in the Expository Times, xlvii, (December, 1955), p. 80; combined the second and fourth reference, and the third and fifth.

[2] Kummel, op. cit., p. 271; "It is not clear how such small epistles or epistolary fragments of Paul could have been preserved nor why the author of the Pastorals should have inserted them so splintered into his epistles. The arrangement of these fragments, which only hint at their situation, into the life of Paul that is known to us is only possible hypothetically. Thus we can obtain no certainty as to whether a section really is a genuine fragment simply because it fits into a situation known to us; and there is no other criterion of authenticity in this case;" and Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 22; feels it is unlikely, as Harrison states it, that historical repetition occurs.

Therefore, it is this author's conclusion that a devout Paulinist wrote these epistles. The epistles represent the second or third generation Christians in Asia Minor, and have direct quotes from Paul. The Pastoral author believed in the Pauline gospel but at the same time placed this gospel in the environment of his day, which due to changed conditions, altered the method of writing. He gave a formal and definite statement of the Christian faith. The Pastoral Epistles exhibit an advanced Christianity. It is a Christianity with a controlled officiary, a developed content of belief, yet a Christianity which is conscious of diversity within itself.

SECTION TWO: ORGANIZATION AND MINISTRY

History has certainly proved to us the value of the Pastoral Epistles in relation to the organization and ministry found within them. In fact, this is where they have previously made their strongest contribution. Even though they do not treat the organizational subject as directly as one would want, they do emphasize this aspect.

The environment being what it was added greatly to the formulation of the ecclesiastical structure that followed. The result is that the author met the need of this critical period with a localized ministry. This became a chief weapon for defending the faith.

The importance of what was found in these epistles provide for us the embryo of the developing church. Some form of leadership and management was required when the church became separate from the synagogue. The test of leadership character that emerges was based upon the ethical quality of the individual's religious life.

Therefore, for us to look at the Pastoral account, we have to look back to the tradition that preceded it. We have to study earlier church structure and the history of Christian organization. After that we will look at some scholarly theories, and then look at the Pastoral account of the organization and ministry.

In the New Testament the word 'apostle' means one who is 'sent off or out;'[1] however, this meaning has little relation to the classical usage of the word.[2] Only on occasion in its Greek background does apostolos have a meaning related or even apparently related to what it means in the New

---

[1] G. A. Buttrick, The Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible, (Abingdon Press, New York), vol. 1, p. 170; and James Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible, (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1909), p. 44.

[2] F. C. Grant, and H. H. Rowley, Dictionary of the Bible, (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1963), p. 46; says the classical usage of the word has a nautical flavor.

Testament.[1] It is not easy to find an adequate parallel for the New Testament usage. On the one hand apostolos refers to the transport, and on the other to the fleet itself.[2] Both are passive in character,[3] and do not refer to the mission at hand. Basically, in classical Greek (Lysias, Demosth.) and later (e.g. Posidon. 87 fgm. 53 Jac.), it refers to a naval expedition, and possibly to its commander.[4]

Rabbinic Judaism allows us to take a step further. Jerome, in his commentary on Galatians, notes a similarity between Jewish and Christian apostles. Sometimes these men preached and taught in synagogues; but their commission was over once they returned to Jerusalem, and it was not transferable by them to others within the community.[5] These men were authorized representatives designated for a certain specified task. Their authority was more juridicial than religious.[6] The Talmud adds, "The Apostle of any one is even as the man himself by whom he is deputed."[7] In Greek Judaism, the term 'apostle' is seldom found.[8]

---

[1] Gerhard Kittel, Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, K.H. Rengstorf (trans. by G. W. Bromley), (William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co.), vol. 1, p. 407; "In the older period apostolos is one of the special terms bound up with sea-faring, and more particularly with military expeditions; it is almost a technical political term in this sense." The second usage is "to be applied to the fleet itself and it thus acquires the meaning of a naval expedition."

[2] J. H. Moulton, and G. Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament, (Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1949), p. 70.

[3] Kittel, op. cit., (K.H. Rengstorf), p. 407.

[4] W. R. Arndt, and F. W. Gindrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, (Cambridge at the University Press, 1957), p. 99; "In contrast in isolated cases it means 'ambassador,' 'delegate,' 'messenger,' (Hdt. 1, 21; 5, 38; Sb. 7241, 48; 3 Km 14; 6A; Is. 18; 2 Sym)."

[5] Buttrick, op. cit., (D), p. 171; "His suggestion has been much debated by modern scholars seeking an origin for both the New Testament use and the meaning of the term." Other fourth century writers refer to "Jewish emissaries of the Jerusalem patriarchate called 'apostle,' sent out to visit the Diaspora, especially to collect taxes for the support of the rabbinate."

[6] Buttrick, op. cit, (D), vol. 1, p. 171.

[7] Hastings, op. cit., (D), p. 44.

[8] Kittel, op. cit., K.H. Rengstorf p. 408; "This is perhaps because the sphere in which it arose was largely closed to Judaism. The Palestinians had no direct

Within the New Testament there is another usage for this word. Basically in the New Testament and in Christian usage 'apostle' has two distinctive connotations. "It is limited to certain men of the first generation of the church's history; and it marks the bearer of the title, among other qualifications, as a missionary of a gospel."[1]

Also implied is a religious quality and a mission in mind. The idea is similar to the rabbinic notion of the 'shaliah.' For Jesus, apostleship "is a purely religious commission to carry out the purpose of God for man's salvation, and it is a life-long authorization given once and for all."[2] The term was applied to a special group of men, twelve in all, at first.[3] It refered not to the act of sending, but denoted the man who was sent with full authority.[4] Paul was a good example; he frequently called himself an apostle.[5]

In the Old Testament the common noun 'prophet' appears over three hundred times,[6] and has various meanings. The word applied to a remarkable range of characters appearing from Genesis to Malachi, from Aaron to an Elijah,

---

access to the sea and were thus under no necessity of equipping or even planning maritime and expeditions. But even the Egyptian Jews never seem to have undertaken sea voyages to any great extent. At any rate we do not find the word in Philo." The term occurs twice in Josephus, and only once in the LXX.

---

[1]Buttrick, op. cit., (D), vol. 1, p. 171; and Hastings, op. cit., (D), p. 44; adds to this by extending the meaning to not just a messenger, but a delegate; Kittel, op. cit., (K.H. Renqstorf), vol 1, p. 422.

[2]Buttrick, op. cit., (D), vol. 1, p. 171.

[3]Grant, and Rowley, op. cit., p. 46; "Later on the Twelve (the eleven plus Matthias) were regarded as the apostles par excellence (Acts 6:2, 6). They were the men who had been with Jesus, and their peculiar function was to testify of Him, and especially of His resurrection. But soon they were not the only Apostles. The title was given to Barnabas (Acts 14:4, 14; 1 Cor. 9:5, 6), perhaps to Andronicus and Junias (Rom. 16:7), and possibly to others (1 Cor. 15:5, 7); and Kittel, op. cit., vol. 1, (K.H. Renqstorf) p. 422; also notes that this term applies to the first "Christian missionaries or their most prominent representatives, including some who did not belong even to the wider groups of disciples."

[4]Kittel, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 421 (K.H. Renqstorf).

[5]Rom. 1:1, 11:13; 1 Cor. 1:1, 9:1f, 15:9; 2 Cor. 1:1; Gal. 1:1; Eph. 1:1; Col. 1:1.

from the true to the false, from the relatively primitive to the sophisticated, from the highly visionary to the concretely ethical, and from the seemingly objective perspective to the intensely participating attitude.[1]

The original root meaning is difficult to determine.[2] One is not too far wrong in using the definition of 'seer.' Although the LXX conveys a slightly different connotation, it says that 'seer' was basically a popular and common name for 'prophet.'

Three periods in the history of prophecy can be distinguished: 1) "Sporadic manifestations before the time of Samuel; 2) the rise and growth of the institution from Samuel to Amos; 3) the period marked out by the canonical prophetic writings."[3] Yet, long before the time of Jesus prophecy ceased to exist, although there were substitutes for it in the apocalyptic writings.[4]

---

[6]Buttrick, op. cit, (D), p. 896; and Hastings, op. cit., (D), p. 757; but Grant and Rowley, op. cit., p. 801; says the exact number cannot be determined.

---

[1]Buttrick, op. cit., (D), p. 896; "It is applied to a remarkable range of characters appearing from Genesis (20:7) to Malachi (4:5), and to surprisingly desparate personalities from an Aaron (Ex. 7:1) to an Elijah (1 Kings 22), from the relatively primitive (1 Sam. 10) to the relatively sophistocated (the Isaishs), from the highly visionary (Ezek. 1-2) to the concretely ethical (Amos, or Nathan in 2 Sam. 12; or Elijah in 1 Kings 21), from the seemingly objective perspective (Amos) to the intensely participating attitude (Jeremiah)."

[2]Hastings, op. cit., (D), p. 757; The word used most is 'nabi,' but its derivation is doubtful. "It was long associated with a root meaning which means 'to bubble up,' and would thus denote the ecstatic influence of influence of inspiration, but it is now more usually connected with a kindred Arabic word meaning to 'announce.' Two other words, roeh, which occurs nine times (seven times in Samuel), and chozeh, about twenty times - are of known derivation and are both translated 'seer.' We shall probably not be far wrong if we find in the words the two main characteristics for the prophet as 'seer' and 'speaker;' also Buttrick, op. cit., (D), p. 896; "recalls the fact that 'he who is now called a prophet was formerly called a seer.' The LXX, apparently presupposing a slightly different text, conveys the sense that the term 'seer' was in the past simply a common, popular name for 'prophet.' The fact remains that one term is normative in the Old Testament and only one; and further, unfortunately, that all arguments of meaning etymologically derived are

Even Josephus records (War. I. 2:18) that John Hyrcanus had the 'gift of prophecy.'[1] Even the Essenes nurtured hopes of prophetic renewal.[2]

From its inception, prophecy was a characteristic mark of Christianity. It was not a gift of all Christians but a peculiar spiritual endowment (charism) of a select number.[3] The book of Acts refers to prophets (11:27, 21:10, 15:32, 21:9, 13:1, 19:6),[4] and Jesus was considered a prophet also.[5] Even though prophecy ceased to appear in Israel, except for a special form in the apocalyptic visions, the Jews expected its revival at the coming of the Messiah.

Acts 2:14f is interpreted as an evident fulfilment of the promise of the Old Testament. There was the anticipation that prophecy would be revived. Acts names only a few as prophets (Agabus, 11:27, 21:11; Judas and Silas, 15:32). Acts also speaks of leaders of the church as prophets (13:1). Basically, the author of Acts was interested in their behavior and activities.

---

inconclusive. We simply do not know and cannot now determine the original meaning of the root."

[3]Hastings, op. cit., (D), p. 757.

[4]Buttrick, op. cit., (D), p. 919; "The Jews however fully expected its revival in the coming age of the Messiah."

---

[1]Buttrick, op. cit., (D), p. 919; "Josephus also states that such messanic pretenders as Theudas (Antiq. XX, 5:1 cf. Acts 5:36) and 'the Egyptian' (Antiq. XX 8:6; War I, 13:5; cf. Acts 21:38) claimed that they were prophets."

[2]Grant and Rowley, op. cit., p. 809; also, Buttrick, op. cit., (D), p. 919.

[3]Buttrick, op. cit., (D), p. 919.

[4]Buttrick, op. cit., (D), p. 919; "The author of Acts appears to have been mainly interested in the predictive features of the prophets activities, and the outward manifestations of their behavior. It is not altogether clear that he distinguished, as did Paul, the gift of 'speaking in tongues' from the prophetic charism."

[5]Hastings, op. cit., (D), p. 764; also Buttrick, op. cit., (D), p. 919; also, Grant and Rowley, op. cit., p. 810; "He did so only rarely (Mark 6:4, Matt. 13:57, Luke 4:24, 13:33), though there is an obvious continuity between his gospel and that of the major Old Testament prophets, in form as well as in content."

In the church the gift of prophecy was highly valued. For Paul, it was a great gift. In fact, he ranked the prophet second only to the apostle.[1] Even in post-apostolic times prophet and prophecy still existed.[2] Nevertheless prophecy exhibited a noticeable decline in its effectiveness.

The term 'teacher' appears many times in Greek literature.[3] Frequently it is a title of respect. It appears in Homer quite often. In Homer it denotes teaching in its widest sense, "whether the point at issue is the imparting of information, the passing on of knowledge, or the acquiring of skills."[4] 'Teacher' calls attention to certain aspects. He may be the one who imparts instruction, or the one who is responsible for its correct performance.[5] The 'teacher' is not just a teacher in general, but one who teaches definite skills.

The term 'teacher' had little connection with religion;[6] yet, it was used constantly in the Koine; the particular meaning was determined by the matter of the object of instruction.[7]

In the LXX, 'teacher' only occurs twice (Esth. 6:1 and 2 Macc. 1:10). In the former passage it is clear that it can have only the sense of 'reader' (which denotes a slave entrusted with educational responsibilities). The

---

[1] Buttrick, op. cit., (D), p. 919; and Grant and Rowley, op. cit., p. 810.
[2] Hastings, op. cit., (D), p. 764; and Buttrick, op. cit., (D), p. 920; and Grant and Rowley, op. cit., p. 810.
[3] Buttrick, op. cit., (D), vol. 4, pp. 522-23; It is found coupled with 'lord,' and 'king.'
[4] Kittel, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 135, (K. H. Renqstorf).
[5] Kittel, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 135. (K. H. Renqstorf).
[6] Kittel, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 136. (K. H. Renqstorf).
[7] Maurice Goguel, The Primitive Church, (The MacMillan Co., New York, 1964), p. 123; "The specifically religious application is exceptional. It is found for example in the hymns of Isis of Andros and of Cumal." (mentioned by Renqstorf, p. 138).

latter passage goes beyond this. Aristobulus was called the king's teacher. The term was dependent on the Jewish use of didaskein, and had an important bearing on the New Testament use of the word.[1] The word was now given a specific context, and Aristobulus was called 'teacher' in the Jewish sense only because his work "served as propaganda for the Jews."[2]

In the New Testament 'teacher' finds application to non-Christian leaders, such as John the Baptist (Luke 3:12), as well as Jesus.[3] Most references are to Jesus, for teaching was one of his most prominent functions. This function was a carry over from the Jewish picture of the didaskalos. However, Jesus gave this term "a tremendous weight which it can never have elsewhere."[4] It indicated both his authority and his dignity.

Unlike the prophet, the teacher found a contemporary model in the Jewish synagogue which carried over to the primitive Christian church. The teacher had a position of high honor. In the early Christian community, the title 'teacher' was given to the leader of the young churches.[5] This person became the expositor of the law (Acts 13:1; 1 Cor. 12:28f; Eph. 4:11; James 3:1), "who makes possible a right fulfilment." Teaching was a function of divine service.[6] It was practical rather than theoretical in its import.[7]

---

[1] Kittel, op. cit., (K. H. Renqstorf) vol. 2, p. 151; Its bearing is important since it "shows the zeal with which Judaism defended itself against the threat of Hellenistic intellectualization, and how this found expression linguistically."

[2] Kittel, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 151, (K. H. Renqstorf).

[3] Buttrick, op. cit., (D), vol. 4, p. 523.

[4] Kittel, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 156; "We might almost dare to say that it stamps Jesus as the new Moses who frees the law from national limitation and offers it to all men." (K. H. Renqstorf).

[5] Buttrick, op. cit., vol. 4, (D), p. 523.

[6] Kittel, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 157f, (K. H. Renqstorf).

[7] Goguel, op. cit., (PC), p. 123-24.

Even though there seems to be a carry over from the Jewish heritage,[1] the 'teacher' through Jesus' ministry acquired a special place of honor in the young church.[2] He was the herald of the gospel, the expositor of the Law who made possible a right fulfilment.[3] He addressed the church and had the responsibility of leading its members in instruction.

The concept of serving is expressed in the word diakonia. It is often hard to differentiate between the concepts of service because the Greeks used various words for serving. But diakaneo refers to a special service to another person, a service of love.[4]

Outside the New Testament the word diakonos has a secular as well as a liturgical sense.[5] Sometimes it is just a word used to suggest the functions

---

[1]Goguel, op. cit., (PC), p. 124; disagrees and feels this office was not found in Judaism; yet, W. Ewing and J. E. H. Thompson, Dictionary of the Bible, (J. M. Dent and Sons, London, 1910), p. 815; says "it was the utterance of one who gave counsel, or 'taught' (yarah) the people the mind and will of God. Under this higher sense of 'teacher' falls the prophet in the Old Testament times (Ex. 24:12). Thus the strangers settled by the Assyrians in Samaria required one to teach them how they should fear the Lord (2 Kings 17:27)."

[2]J. Von Allmen, Vocabulary of the Bible, (Lutterworth Press, London, 1958), p. 415; "In teaching scripture, Jesus is in reality speaking of Himself, for scripture bears witness of him (John 5:39; 45-47). It is this testimony of scripture which supplies the foundation of the absolute authority which He claims (John 5:31-38) and which so impresses his hearers (Mark 1:22, Matthew 7:29, Luke 4:32). The Jewish teachers were content to comment on the law and to place before their hearers the abstract requirements of God. When Jesus teaches, it is the very will of God which is present in His person."

[3]Kittel, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 157, (K.H. Rengstorf).

[4]Kittel, op. cit., (K.H. Rengstorf), vol. 2, p. 81; "δουλεύω means to serve as a slave, with a stress on subjection. θεραπεύω emphasises willingness for service and the respect and concern thereby expressed. λατρεύω means to serve for wages. ὑπηρετέω means at root to seer. As distinct from all these terms, διακονέω has the special quality of indicating very personally the service rendered to another. It is thus closest to ὑπηρετέω but in διακονέω there is a stronger approximation to the concept of a service of love; and Arndt and Gindrich, op. cit., p. 183.

[5]Buttrick, op. cit., (D), vol. 1, p. 786; "There is some analogy in liturgical, though not in pastoral functions, between the Christian deacon and the 'hazzan' (ὑπερέτης) who assisted the ruler of a Jewish synagogue. Both in the LXX and in the classical Greek writers, the word 'deacon' has a secular sense - of servants, messengers, and civil officials."

of a waiter or a menial servant.[1] To the Greek, serving was not very dignified. In fact the formula of the Sophist was, "How can a man be happy when he has to serve someone?" This expresses the basic Greek attitude of Plato.[2] Servanthood was not a respectable role to the Greek, unless the service was rendered to the state.[3]

Within Eastern thinking, there was nothing unworthy in serving.[4] Judaism showed a deep understanding of the meaning of service, and the relation of servant and master was accepted. Throughout the Old Testament, service was a commitment to one's neighbor, but by the time of Christ this had altered again.[5] It is noteworthy that the LXX does not use the term diakonein at all, but renders the Hebrew equivalent. And diakonia is only found in the LXX twice.[6] 'Deacon' in the LXX has a secular sense.[7]

In classical Greek times 'serving' was not very dignified; however in the New Testament 'serving' was the height of Christian character. The New Testament view of service grew out of love. Service was the ethical conduct

---

[1] Buttrick, op. cit., (D), vol. 1, p. 786.
[2] W. R. W. Lamb, Plato (Gorg. 491e), (William Heinemann, London, 1946), p. 411.
[3] Ibid. p. 511f; this view also is found in Aristotle and Hellenism.
[4] Kittel, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 83; "The relation of a servant to his master is accepted, especially when he serves a great master. This is supremely true of the relation of man to God," (H.W. Beyer).
[5] Kittel, op. cit., (H.W. Beyer) vol. 2, p. 83; "A sharp distinction came to be made between the righteous and the unrighteous in the antitheses of the Pharisess, and this disolved the unconditional command of love and service. There arose the attitude lashed by Jesus in the parable of the Good Samaritan. Again, the service was less and less understood as a sacrifice for others and more and more as work of merit before God. Finally, there arose in Judaism the idea, which is so obvious to the natural man, not to accord service, especially service at table, to the unworthy."
[6] Kittel, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 87; 1 Macc. 11:58 and Est. 6:5, (H.W. Beyer).
[7] Buttrick, op. cit., vol. 1, (D), p. 786.

of man. In the gospels (Matthew 20:26, 23:11 and John 2:5, 9) and in Paul's epistles (2 Corinthians 6:4, 11:23, Colossians 1:23-25) service was the ethical duty of the Christian. Service had come to mean in its fullest sense active Christian love for our neighbor, and as such it was a mark of true discipleship of Jesus.

Thus far 'deacon' had not become an office, and the term still referred to a function.[1] In Acts diakonos was never employed.[2] In the Gentile churches there was an emergence of an office: one of administration and practical service.[3] In Philemon (1:1), there was a link between the deacon and the bishop; and in the Pastorals the relationship was confirmed.

The term 'elder' originated in primitive times. Within the typical family of the Hebrews there prevailed a rudimentary form of government from which the 'elder' had his position.[4] Numerous verses of scripture revealed the position of the elder within the earliest Jewish communities. In Exodus, Numbers and Deuteronomy this held true.[5] The term 'elder' was found in other Semitic races also.[6]

---

[1] Grant and Rowley, op. cit., p. 204.

[2] Grant and Rowley, op. cit., p. 204; "But 6:1-6, where we read of the appointment of the Seven, sheds a ray of light on its history, and probably serves to explain how from the general sense of one who renders Christian service it came to be applied to a special officer.

[3] Kittel, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 90; "That the primary task of deacons was one of administration and practical service may be deduced: a) from the qualities demanded of them, b) from the use of the term for table waiters and more generally for servants, c) from their relationship to the bishop, and d) from what we read elsewhere in the New Testament concerning the gift and task of diakonia," (H.W. Beyer).

[4] Grant and Rowley, op. cit., p. 238; "As the father is head of the household, so the chiefs of the principle families ruled the clan and the tribe, their authority being ill-defined, and like that of an Arab sheik, depending on the consent of the governed; also Hastings, op. cit., (D), p. 211.

[5] Exodus 3:16, 18; 12L2, 17:5f; 18:12; 19:2; Numbers 11:16; Deuteronomy 5:23; 27:1; 31:28.

[6] Hastings, op. cit., (D), p. 211.

The common Hebrew word 'elder' found in Ezekiel, was derived from the root meaning 'chin' or 'beard.' The conclusion was that an elder was a grown-up man.[1] In non-Jewish Greek, the term 'old' or 'older' was "almost the invariable meaning of the noun."[2] This idea of age was the key behind the word 'elder.' Being an elder was a prerequisite for any official appointment. The elder was a constant figure in Israel's life from its earliest conception. The use of the term 'elder' is also found in civil life to denote a local village officer which must have helped prepare the way in Gentile circles for its acceptance in its new connotation.[3]

In the New Testament, the official use of the term 'elder' probably stemmed from the heritage of Israel. The story of the 'prodigal son' (Luke 15:25), exemplified the meaning as 'older' person. Otherwise the term 'elder' was used in a technical sense. In this context 'elders' were persons holding a specific office and carrying out a special function in the community, whether of Judaism or the Christian Church.[4]

By New Testament times each Jewish community had its council of elders or its presbytery.[5] Their primary duty was judicial. Jewish elders had no responsibility for worship in the synagogue; yet, they enjoyed a position of interpreting the law.[6]

Christian 'elders' were local leaders, different from the apostles.

---

[1] Buttrick, op. cit., (D), vol. 2, p. 72; "Elders are thus grown-up men, powerful in themselves, by reason of personality, prowess or stature, or influential as members of powerful families. They are local dignitaries or local rulers. There were elders in ancient Greece and Rome, the sheiks (elders) are characteristic of Arabia. Elders were known too in ancient Egypt (Gen. 50:7), and among the Moabites and Midianites (Numbers 22:7).

[2] Easton, op. cit., p. 188.

[3] George Milligan, Here and There Among the Papyri, (Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1923), p. 65.

[4] Buttrick, op. cit., (D), vol. 2, p. 73.

[5] Buttrick, op. cit., (D), vol. 2, p. 73; "In the Diaspora it was commonly called γερουσία and the elders were termed 'archons' ἄρχοντες."

[6] Buttrick, op. cit., (D), vol. 2, p. 73.

There was nothing that definitely told us that they had a charismatic responsibility.[1] Some say elders were identical with bishops until Ignatius.[2]

The word 'presbyter' was rendered 'elder' and some used the theory that the two words meant the same, and were so closely connected with bishop (episkopos), that they must be taken together.[3] Presbuteros basically meant an older man.[4]

Episkopos was best rendered as 'overseer,' or 'superintendent,' or 'watch,' and from this original definition a two-fold use of the word emerged.[5] This usage was found in the secular Greek as well as Judaism. On the one hand it denoted God as the absolute episkopos who did everything; He was the creator and guardian of every soul. In the other usage, episkopos was the 'overseer.' Some said this meaning did not define any particular office,[6] but others felt it defined a definite function or a fixed office with a group.[7]

The term 'bishop' was common in Greek literature. Homer applied it to gods. The Cynic-Stoic philosophers used the term to describe their own mission as heralds of the gods. Syrian inscriptions used the term to designate overseers of buildings, provisions and coins. And the cult associations of Greece and Aegean isles record the term in reference to directors and cashiers.[8]

---

[1] Buttrick, op. cit., (D), vol. 2, p. 73.
[2] Ewing and Thomson, op. cit., p. 69; "As a matter of fact it seems certain that at first bishops and elders and presbyters were identical."
[3] Hastings, op. cit., (D), p. 99; also, Grant and Rowley, op. cit., p. 107.
[4] Buttrick, op. cit., (D), p. 874.
[5] Kittel, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 609; "In Greek, ἐπίσκοπος is first used a) with a free understanding of the 'onlooker' as 'watcher,' 'protector,' 'patron.' His activity then takes the form of the different senses of ἐπισκέπτομαι and especially ἐπισκοπέω, in a gracious looking down upon the one protected and in care for him. Therewith the word ἐπίσκοπος comes to be used, b) as a title to denote various offices."
[6] Grant and Rowley, op. cit., p. 107.
[7] Arndt and Gingrich, op. cit., p. 299.
[8] Buttrick, op. cit., (D), vol. 1, p. 442.

Therefore, episkopos was not a term created by Christianity.[1]

The LXX used episkopos in the same "twofold way as secular Greek."[2] God was the absolute 'overseer,' who saw everything (Wis. 1:6). Philo said that God saw what was concealed in the heart of man.[3] Men as episkopoi were different in the LXX. There was no closely defined office.[4]

In the New Testament usage there was a similar picture, yet somewhat different. The term episkopos occurs only five times in the New Testament.[5] And, it had different usages - from the title given to Christ, to the title given to leaders of the church. Ignatius and the Didache (15:1-2) also refer to bishops.

Let us move now from the origin of terminology, to the history of Christian organization. The book of Acts is considered and referred to quite often as an historical document giving a history of much of what happened from Pentecost through Paul's life. There were differences of opinion as to what was history and what was theoretical idealization.[6]

---

[1] Goguel, op. cit., (PC), p. 124; "It is to be found in the Septuagint with the meaning of overseer; it is applied to God in Job 20:29. Elsewhere the word is used of a magistrate, provincial governor (1 Macc. 1:5; Judges 9:28; Isaish 40:17; Numbers 31:14; 2 Kings 11:15, 12:11), the chief priests or Levites (Neh. 11:9, 14:22);" also Edwin Hatch, The Organization of the Early Christian Churches, (Livingtons, London, 1882), pp. 36-46; says that the word episkopos came into the Christian church from the heathen confraternities and was used for the leaders in the Gentile Christian society."

[2] Kittel, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 614; Wis. 1:6, (H.W. Beyer).

[3] F. H. Colson, Philo (Magr. Abr. 115), (William Heinemann, London, 1949), p. 197f.

[4] Kittel, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 614, (H.W. Beyer).

[5] 1 Peter 2:25 (Christ is called episkopos); Phil. 1:1; Acts 20:28; 1 Tim. 3:2; and Tit. 1:7 (these passages show that men are called episkopos).

[6] Goguel, op. cit., (PC), p. 136; "The book of Acts affords two strata of evidence which are closely intermingled. On the one hand, there is evidence which had been more or less accurately handed down about the ministries which had been in operation, both at Jerusalem and in the Pauline communities, at the time to which the narrative in Acts refers. On the other hand there is a conception of the church's organization which is a rather theoretical idealization of memories left by the first generation, and in its way an explanatory myth to justify the set-up of the Church as it was at the time when Acts was compiled."

The author of Acts gave the first information about some type of organization.[1] The organization grew out of history, and yet produced history.

Clearly seen in Acts was the unified picture of the religious and social life of the growing church. Yet, one cannot find a definite outline of the structure of the church. Within the framework of Acts, the author made apparent some continuity with Judaism; yet showed that the church faced daily tasks, and changed and developed. The Christians met needs and faced them, and this caused developmental and structural changes. It is necessary to keep in mind that the author of Acts was not writing to point out the origin of some type of office or deep structural organization.

In Acts 6:1-6, there was an appointment of seven men. No title was given them, although the main reason for their appointment was service.[2] It is important to know this was practical service. This was their duty, and they were not given a title, such as deacons.[3] It was a subordinate office.[4]

'Elders' were mentioned in many passages in Acts.[5] The question is,

---

[1]Eduard Schweizer, Church Order in the New Testament, (SCM Press, London, 1961), p. 63; "Thus what already stands out in Matthew is here reflected much more clearly. For Luke it is not merely that Jesus, as an interpreter of the law, for example, lives on in the obedience of the Church - there is for him a real Church history filling out the time between Easter and the parousia." Hans Conzelmann, An Outline of the Theology of the NT, SCM Press, 1968.

[2]Acts 6:1 and 6:4 - διακονία is used and in Acts 6:2, διακονεῖν is referred to.

[3]Charles Gore, The Ministry of the Christian Church, (Longmans, Green and Co., London, 1893), p. 264; calls this an inferior office. "In these seven we must see the prototype of the deacons." He says this is part of the local ministry.

[4]Schweizer, op. cit., p. 74; "The absence of a title shows he is thinking of a single case in a special situation, not of the introduction of a great diaconate."

[5]Acts 11:30; 14:23; 15:2, 4, 6, 22, 23; 16:4; 21:18.

did this refer to an ecclesiastical situation,[1] or just an existence of a group of presbyters?[2] The answer to this could tell us one of two things - first, either there was a definite genuine order within the church; or secondly, there was the action of the church meeting a situation, which does not always imply a definite and continuing order. The difficulty existed in the translation of the passages, but the second alternative seemed more feasible. It seemed that the absence of a real title showed that this was action in a situational problem, not the formation of a specific office. Therefore, at its inception, the eldership was not an office. At this stage it was only an assumption. The passages speak in generalizations, not in specifics, concerning 'elders.'

Again in Acts 13:1-3, prophets and teachers were mentioned, including Saul and Barnabas. Prophets were mentioned elsewhere (11:27, 21:10, 15:32). Yet, none of these passages gave evidence for an order.

Not once in Acts was the term episkopos used directly to designate an office, although Goguel had said it was an equivalent to the term 'presbyter,' when used in the twentieth chapter;[3] however, even he felt that it was a temporary situation until in the future monarchical episcopate prevailed.

---

[1]Goguel, op. cit., (PC), p. 137; "Acts mentions presbyters with the Twelve (xi, 30, xv passim), next with James (xxi, 18) and also with those who had been set up by Barnabas and Paul in each town on their return from their first missionary journey (xiv, 23). But there is no definite information about them. The statements reflect the ecclesiastical situation at the time of the compilation of Acts."

[2]Gore, op. cit., p. 263; "We find the existence of presbyters in the church at Jerusalem assumed. This is probably to be accounted for by the fact that there Jewish 'presbyters' were an institution of old standing and that the Christian 'synagogue' naturally had the like. It is however very easy to exaggerate the Jewish character of these church officers."

[3]Goguel, op. cit., (PC), pp. 136-7; "The term 'bishop' is only found in the Acts in the speech at Miletus, in such a context as makes it the exact equivalent of the term 'presbyter.' It is in connection with a collective ministry (20:17, 28). But the evidence of Acts concerning the episcopate amounts to more than that. The picture of the Church at Jerusalem before AD 44 is that of a community directed by a college, the twelve,

From Acts it was impossible to draw a picture that showed a definite structure. Because of the situation there was only a sketch of what needed to be done. The church leaders in Acts reacted to their environment, and their actions were influenced accordingly.

From Acts we move to church organization as it is seen in the Apostolic Fathers. The Epistle of Clement to the Romans should be considered first.[1] Tradition has dated it between AD 70 and AD 110, and there is general agreement among scholars to date it in the last decade of the first century.[2]

In this epistle there were three offices mentioned. The ambiguity of Clement makes it difficult to say whether some of the references were distinct

---

which had as its head one man, Peter, who without possessing a real primacy acted as a mouthpiece and whose personality exercised directive power. For the period after AD 44, although Acts does not call James a bishop, as tradition later was to do, Harnack could maintain that it pictured him as a true bishop and even as a monarchical bishop. The dualism existing between what may be called, 'cum grano salis,' the collective episcopacy of the Twelve, and the monarchical episcopacy of James, reflects a situation which could only be temporary until the monarchical episcopate prevailed over the collective episcopate, with which at first it co-existed after it had emerged from it."

---

[1] Kirsopp Lake, The Apostolic Fathers, vol. 1, (The MacMillan Co., London, 1912), p. 3; "The writing which has always been known by this name is clearly, from internal evidence, a letter sent by the church of Rome to the church of Corinth in consequence of trouble in the latter community which had led to the deposition of certain Presbyters. The church of Rome writes protesting against this deposition, and the partizanship which has caused it. The actual name of the writer is not mentioned in the letter itself; indeed, it clearly claims to be not the letter of a single person but of a church. Tradition, however, has always ascribed it to Clement, who was, according to the early episcopal lists, the third or fourth bishop of Rome during the last decades of the first century."

[2] J. A. Kleist, The Epistles of St. Clement of Rome and St. Ignatius of Antioch, (The Newman Bookshop, Maryland, 1946), p. 4; and Lake, op. cit., (AF), pp. 4-5; "It is safest to say that it must be dated between 75 and 110 AD; but within these limits there is a general agreement among critics to regard a most probable the last decade of the first century."

offices or merely a way of explaining a ministry.[1]

In section 1:3, there is a division made by Clement between older and younger. He compliments the people for "paying all fitting honor to the older among you." Clement uses presbuterois which means 'presbyters' or 'older.' There is question as to whether this is a distinct reference to a ministry or to a tradition. Other passages refer to the attitude of 'older' and 'younger' to each other.[2] Clement also mentions in this same passage obedience to rulers (tois agoumenois), which is a term used in speaking of civil leaders and military leaders. Therefore, Clement must have an authoritarian conception of the church.[3]

Presbuteroi is used in 57:1 as either a group of leaders or possibly older men; this holds true in 54:2 and 47:6 also. However, in 44:5 there is

---

[1]Gore, op. cit., p. 322; "It is generally supposed that in Clement's Epistle we have only two orders of ministries, viz. presbyter-bishop and deacons, recognised in the church. But this supposition---though there need be no objection to it on the ground of principle---does not seem to account for all the phenomena which the epistle presents. It is quite true that presbyters are also called bishops, that there is no local authority in the Church 'at Corinth' above the presbyters." Streeter, op. cit., p. 215; "'Presbyter' would seem to be a term connoting not so much office as status. Among those who enjoy the status of presbyter are included a class of episkopoi, and (possibly) also the deacons. At any rate, as in Philippians, bishops and deacons are the names of two kinds of officers. These two offices are spoken of by Clement in in a way which excludes the possibility that presbyters is the name of a third and intermediate office;" and Schweizer, op. cit., p 149; "So the penetration of a secular and civil idea of office goes hand in hand with a mainly religious concept, widespread both in the Old Testament and in the pagan world; and again it makes no decisive difference whether it is the fundamental separation of the official from the ordinary subject, or of the priest from the layman, or of the ecstatic from one not moved by the Spirit."

[2]Lake, op. cit., (AF), (Clement 3:3; 21:6), p. 13 and 47.

[3]Goguel, op. cit., (PC), p. 140; The same term used to cover those ruling the church also is used for civil authority. "The laity owe obedience and respect to the clergy."

a hint to the function of this office and its relationship to the episcopate.[1]

Episkopos as a title is used in only two chapters,[2] and is referred to as a status in one of those chapters.[3] Deacons are mentioned with the bishop as appointed delegates tested, of course, by the Spirit. This is not a new method. It has been done before; and because it is a scriptural command, they feel they are fulfilling the Old Testament.[4] Public worship constitutes the major function of this office.[5]

---

[1]Lake, op. cit., (AF), (Clement 44:5), p. 85; is a compliment to those 'presbyters' who have done what they ought to have done, and have been fruitful in their task; and they shall be rewarded. The previous passage mentions the episcopate. The author is referring to an ejection of those who have "blamelessly and holily offered its sacrifices," and says that their sin would be great if this happens. It seems that the 'presbyters' in one passage is synonymous with the 'episcopate' in the other.

[2]Lake, op. cit., (AF), (42:4-5), p. 81; "They preached from district to district, and from city to city, and they appointed their first converts, testing them by the Spirit, to be bishops and deacons of the future believers. And this was no new method, for many years before had bishops and deacons been written of; for the scripture says thus in one place 'I will establish their bishops in righteousness, and their deacons in faith.'" (44:1); "Our Apostles also knew through our Lord Jesus Christ that there would be strife for the title of bishop."

[3]Lake, op. cit., (AF), (44:4), p. 85; "For our sin is not small, if we eject from the episcopate those who have blamelessly and holily offered its sacrifices."

[4]Schweizer, op. cit., p. 149; "The appointment of bishops and deacons is even turned into a scriptural command by the (probably unintentional) changing of the Old Testament (42:5). So the penetration of a secular and civil idea of office goes hand in hand with a mainly religious concept, widespread both in the Old Testament and in the pagan world; and again it makes no decisive difference whether it is the fundamental separation of the official from the ordinary subject, or of the priest from the layman, or of the ecstatic from one not moved by the Spirit."

[5]Adolf Harnack, The Constitution and Law of the Church in the First Two Centuries, (Williams and Norgate, London, 1910), p. 70; "('to offer the gifts,' xl. 4; 'to perform offerings and ministrations,' xl. 2; 'to make offerings,' xl.4; 'ministration,' is used in chapter 44 alternately with 'bishop's office.')."

Basically, there is not an established monarchical episcopate. There are appointed officials, appointed by the church (44:3), which is a different situation from that of the New Testament.[1] The structure is for order; but order is an end in itself, and is "buttressed with a whole system of thought."[2] Bishops and deacons are separated, but they are called presbyters also. Each person is described according to his function.[3]

The epistles of Ignatius, the third bishop of Antioch in Syria,[4] shows a definite office that will remain. It is the office of Bishop and it was of

---

[1]Schweizer, op. cit., p. 147; "In the New Testament there are no majority decisions; and so here too, just as in the setting up in authority of individual office-bearers, secular and civil order comes in and overshadows the testimony given by the Church with its own appropriate order, just as in the Didache pagan religious standards succeed in entering. But that can be seen elsewhere too. Our letter, in common with all the writings in which the Church is seen particularly in its historicity, shows that the problem of the tradition is becoming acute."

[2]Schweizer, op. cit., p. 148; "What is now seen is not the church's peculiar position as one called out of the world and united with its risen Lord (however much it may at the same time remain involved in all earthly circumstances), but only its ordained position as part of the whole of nature."

[3]Goguel, op. cit., (PC), p. 143; "Clement seems to use the term bishop when he is treating the ecclesiastical office in abstract terms, while, when he is speaking about a concrete case, particularly what happened at Corinth, he uses the term presbyter."

[4]Lake, op. cit., (AF), vol. 1, p. 166; "He was the third bishop of Antioch in Syria, and was condemned to be sent to Rome to be killed by the beasts in the amphitheater. His journey took him through various churches in Asia Minor and while he was in Symrna he wrote letters to Ephesus, Magnesia, Tralles, and Rome and later on, when he reached Troas he wrote to the Philadelphians, Smyrnaeans, and Polycarp the bishop of Smyrna. In his 'chronicon' Eusebius fixed the date of his martyrdom in Rome in the ten year of Trajan, i.e. 108 AD. Modern critics are by no means unanimous as to the correctness of this date, but, though each has his own special preferences, there is a general tendency to think that Ignatius was really a martyr in Rome in the time of Trajan (98-117 AD)."

utmost importance.[1] The office demanded obedience. The episcopate is established and permanent, but nothing is said of its origin.

Except in the Epistle to the Romans the bishop is the center of the epistles, and nothing can be done without him.[2] He even represents God (Polyc. 6:1; Eph. 5:3; Magn. 3:1f). Obedience to the bishop is obedience to Christ.[3] "Be subject to the bishop and to one another, even as Jesus Christ was subject to the Father, and the Apostles were subject to the Father, in order that there may be union both of flesh and of spirit." (Magn. 13:2).

Presbyters and deacons are also a part of the ecclesiastical organization described in Ignatius' letters (Phil., introduction, 4:1, 7:1; Smyrna 12:1, Polyc. 6:1). A gradation of offices seems to exist.[4] Organization is tight,

---

[1]Schweizer, op. cit., p. 152f; "We can see here that Ignatius' view proceeds rather from the Pauline-Johannine than from the Lucan one; for he thinks of an office as something finally static, a constituent part of the 'building' which is God's temple, and something that remains constant throughout the centuries;" also Goguel, op. cit., (PC), p. 146f; "The ecclesiastical organization disclosed by Ignatius's Epistles is relatively simple; it is completely episcopal. The apostles belong entirely to the past; prophets and didaskaloi are not mentioned. The offices which recur again and again in Ignatius's instructions, are those of bishops, priests and deacons. They are closely connected together in the form of a hierarchy and all these demand strict obedience from the faithful."

[2]Lake, op. cit., (AF); Eph. 4:1; Magn. 6:1, 7:1, 13:1; Trall. 2:2, 3:1, 7:2, 13:2; and Smyrn. 8:2.

[3]Lake, op. cit., (AF), pp. 213-4; Trallians 2:1, "For when you are in subjection to the bishop as to Jesus Christ it is clear to me that you are living not after men, but after Jesus Christ, who died for our sake, that believing on his death you may escape death."

[4]Schweizer, op. cit., p. 154; "The co-existence of different spiritual gifts has become a gradation of offices. If in Paul's writings the most that could be said was that the confession of the Lord, the usefulness to the Church, and therefore the strength of the love that seeks not self but others proved to be stronger in the performance of some ministries than in others, by now a statically valid gradation is reached, the elder being subordinated to the bishop (cf. Trall. 12:2), and the deacons to the bishop and presbytery (Magn. 2; also Eph. 2). So the scale is greatly emphasized by the titles, a careful distinction being made between the 'right reverend' bishop, the 'reverend' elders, and the 'fellow servants' the deacons (Magn. 2; cf. 13:1 and similarly fairly often);" and Hatch, op. cit., (CL), p. 84; "In subordination, yet next in order to him stands a college of presbyters which acts as a council, with special seats of honor in the community. They seem to act, not as individuals but only

possibly due to the environment of the times.[1] Ecclesiastical order is firmly rooted.

The time, place and origin of the Didache[2] is much debated.[3] However, this author is assuming that it falls into the same general period of history with the Pastorals.

Chapters 11-13 and 15 contain instruction to Christian congregations concerning various classes of ministers of the gospel. The order was remarkably clear and logical.

There is a clear line drawn between apostles, prophets, teachers; and the bishops and deacons. The former is not localized,[4] the latter is.

---

as a council (but their powers are hardly touched upon at all), and they have no other name than 'the presbyters' (their number is not stated). Finally there come the deacons (an indefinite number), who do not form a college but appear as individuals. They are the executive organs of the bishop in divine service and in the work of administration, and for this reason are very closely associated with him (hence the affinity of bishop and deacon, which is also to be observed elsewhere)."

---

[1] J. A. Faulkner, Burning Questions in Historic Christianity, (The Abingdon Press, New York, 1930), p. 116; "The whole country was seething with new ideas, stirred by itinerant prophets of new cults, and some of these preachers were none too pure in conduct, so that both the religious and the moral life of the Christians was in danger of dissolution, a danger based in the first instance on the doctrinal slipperiness of the Gnostic, Isic and other Oriental teachers. Organization had to be made tighter."

[2] Lake, op. cit., (AF), p. 307; "As it stands the Didache may be described as a manual of Church instruction. The first part, 'The Two Ways,' is a statement of the principles of Christian conduct, which is to be taught to catechumens before their baptism (chap. 1-6); then follows a series of instructions as to the practice of Christian worship, Baptism, Fasting, the Eucharist, the discrimination and treatment of Apostles and Prophets, the Worship on Sunday, Bishops and Deacons (chap. 7-15); finally a short statement of the eschatological hope is appended for the warning and encouragement of Christians."

[3] J. A. Robinson, Barnabas, Hermas and the Didache, (The MacMillan Co., New York, 1920), p. 43; "No agreement has been reached as to its date, or the sources of its composition, or its historical value as witness to the early organization of the Christian Church. Its date has been placed by capable critics in every decade of the century from AD 60 to AD 160;" also Philip Schaff, The Oldest Church Manual, (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1885), p. 122; says between 90 and 100 AD.

[4] Chapter 11:3, and 13:2; Schweizer, op. cit., p. 144; disagrees with teacher travelling.

The former were inspired, the latter elected. None of these offices were defined specifically,[1] although the inspired office had certain tasks mentioned (chap. 11 and 13).

The triad (apostles, prophets, teachers) is found, "but it is questionable whether it has more than a chance terminological significance."[2] The apostles are not the Twelve,[3] but are travelling evangelists. The prophets are instructors and comforters of converts,[4] and must have the behavior of the Lord.[5] The teachers chief function is instruction.

The local churches are ruled by bishops and deacons, who are elected by the church.[6] Their primary function is with public worship,[7] not speaking the "word;"[8] but their work is not to be under estimated.[9] There is no

---

[1]Goguel, op. cit., (PC), p. 144; "As these offices are taken for granted the author does not define them. But the fact that according to 10:7, the prophet, who presides at the eucharist, may offer thanksgiving in words of his own chosing, i.e. may pray 'ex tempore' instead of using a prescribed ritual, shows that when a prophet was present, he presided at the service. The prophets, who are here explicitly associated with the didaskaloi, are made out in 13:4, to be 'the high-priests' of the Christians. From this it is inferred that they have a right to receive in payment the first-fruits of the income of the faithful. Included among the prophets' religious duties is undoubtedly that of teaching."

[2]Schweizer, op. cit., pp. 143-4; "Apostles are not the twelve, but men who move from church to church (II.3ff.). We cannot now say whether, and if so how, they are distinguished from prophets. In 13:1f and 15:1f there is only the dyad prophets and teachers. An untruthful apostle is not a false apostle, but a false prophet (II.5f; cf. 9f); and one may therefore ask whether 'apostles' is not merely an additional term for prophets, to emphasize their divine mission."

[3]Schaff, op. cit., p. 67; also F. E. Vokes, The Riddle of the Didache, (The MacMillan Co., New York, 1938), p. 151; He goes on to say that the apostles are lay figures (p. 152).

[4]Schaff, op. cit., p. 70.

[5]Vokes, op. cit., p. 152.

[6]Goguel, op. cit., p. 142; also Harnack, op. cit., (CL), p. 80.

[7]Gore, op. cit., p. 277.

[8]Harnack, op. cit., (CL), p. 80; "They show that 'speaking the word' (λόγον λαλεῖν) is not in itself one of their functions, but that this ministration, λειτουργία (owing to the lack of prophets and teachers) is beginning to pass into their hands.

[9]Harnack, op. cit., (CL), p. 80.

division of labor between them.[1] The lack of mention of the presbyters indicates either that they are not any, or else they are identical with another office. The ministry in the local church is developed when the charismatic ministry passed on.

The Epistle of Barnabas,[2] has few direct statements of church order. It only mentions prophets, apostles, and teachers (didaskaloi in this reference is probably only meant in a general way). Although, the author alludes to himself as a teacher (1:8).[3]

Streeter suggests we regard the Epistle of Barnabas as one written by a revered teacher.[4] To do this meant reading it not as a sermon but as a summary statement of what the author conceived to be the very heads of his special

---

[1]Thomas M. Lindsay, The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries, (Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1902), p. 11; "They had the same qualities of meekness, uprightness, proved Christian character, and the absence of avarice are demanded of both."

[2]Lake, op. cit., pp. 337f; "The document which is always known as the Epistle of Barnabas is, like 1 Clement, really anonymous, and it is generally regarded as impossible to accept the tradition which ascribes it to the Barnabas who was a companion of St. Paul, though it is convenient to continue to use the title ... The date of Barnabas is doubtful. Two attempts have been made to fix it from internal evidence. In the first place, the ten kings in chap. 6 have been identified with the Roman Emperors, and thus a date well within the limits of the first century has been suggested, though there is not unanimity as to the exact manner in which the number of the ten Emperors is to be reached. In the second place attention has been drawn to the reference in chap. 16 to the rebuilding of the Temple, and this is supposed to refer to the events of 132 AD. Neither theory is quite satisfactory, but neither date is in itself impossible. The document no doubt belongs to the end of the first or beginning of the second century;" also, William Cunningham, Epistle of St. Barnabas, (MacMillan and Co., London, 1877), p. 29; says between 70 and 131 AD.

[3]Lake, op. cit., (AF), (1:8), p. 343; "But I will show you a few things, not as a teacher but as one of yourselves, in which you shall rejoice at this present time;" and (4:9, p. 351); "And though I wish to write much, I hasten to write in devotion to you, not as a teacher, but as it becomes one who loves to leave out nothing of that which we have. Wherefore let us pay heed in the last days, for the whole time of our life and faith will profit us nothing, unless we resist, as becomes the sons of God in this present evil time, against the offences which are to come, that the Black One may have no opportunity of entry."

[4]Streeter, op. cit., p. 248; "... in order to provide them with some record of the essential features in his teaching."

message - including his choicest (and most original) efforts in the way of allegorising the Old Testament.[1]

No matter how this epistle is read, it is apparent that church government was the furthest thing from the author's mind. However, this does not guarantee that there was no such organization.

The Epistle to the Philippians by Polycarp,[2] shows us two ministries - presbyters and deacons.[3] In chapter 5, young men are subject to these officers as they would be to God or to Christ.[4]

In this epistle the deacons' role or duty is not explained in any way, but there are references to his character.[5] Goguel feels deacons are subordinated to elders here.[6] This must be an assumption from what he reads concerning the character of the deacon.

---

[1] Streeter, op. cit., p. 248.

[2] Lake, op. cit., (AF), p. 280; "Polycarp was the Bishop of Smyrna in the first half of the second century, and was martyred, in all probability, on February 23rd, 155 AD, at the age of eighty-six. He had been a disciple of John, and opinions differ as to whether this John was the son of Zebedee, or John the Presbyter. According to Irenaeus Polycarp wrote several epistles, but only one is extant. This is the epistle sent to the Philippians in connection with Ignatius." Also, there are many scholars today who would prefer to say that there are two epistles not one: P. N. Harrison, Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philippians, (Cambridge, 1936), and L. W. Barnard, Studies in the Apostolic Fathers and Their Background, (Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1966), p. 31.

[3] Widows are mentioned, and may possibly be an order, but will not be considered so here.

[4] Lake, op. cit., (AF), vol. 1, pp. 289-90; "Likewise also let the younger men be blameless in all things; caring above all for purity, and curbing themselves from all evil; for it is good to be cut off from the lust of the things in the world, because "every lust wareth against the Spirit, and neither fornicators nor the effeminate nor sodomites shall inherit the Kingdom of God, nor they who do iniquitous things. Wherefore it is necessary to refrain from all these things, and to be subject to the presbyters and deacons as to God and Christ."

[5] Lake, op. cit., (AF), vol. 1, p. 289; "Likewise must the deacons be blameless before his righteousness, as the servants of God and Christ and not of man, not slanderers, not double-tongued, not lovers of money, temperate in all things, compassionate, careful, walking according to the truth of the Lord, who was the 'servant of all;" Goguel would disagree and say that this is his duty being explained (p. 150).

[6] Goguel, op. cit., (PC), p. 150; "This is unique; in all other documents they are associated with the bishops whose auxillaries they are."

The requirement for presbyters deals also with character and not with duties relating to a given office.[1] The one thing that is said of the elders but not of the deacons, is that only the elders are instructed to "bring back those that have wandered" (chap. 6).[2] Whether we are to consider Polycarp a presbyter is questionable.[3]

The word episkopos is missing from this epistle.[4] One would expect to find a monarchical episcopate and possibly this is to be assumed. Either there is no episkopos, or the episkopos is identical with one of the classes mentioned. Presbyter and deacons are the only office-bearers, and their duties are far from exhaustive.

Concerning organizational ministry, the Sheperd of Hermas[5] is another

---

[1] Lake, op. cit., (AF), vol. 1, p. 291; "... and let the presbyters also be compassionate, merciful to all, bringing back those that have wandered, caring for all the weak, neglecting neither widow, nor orphan nor poor, but 'ever providing for that which is good before God and man,' refraining from all wrath, respect of persons, unjust judgment, being far from all love of money, not quickly believing evil of any, not hasty in judgment, knowing that 'we all owe the debt of sin."

[2] Goguel, op. cit., (PC), p. 150; assumes this means they had a duty to teach and a cure of souls.

[3] James Donaldson, The Apostolical Fathers, (MacMillan and Co., London, 1874), p. 240; 'We must regard Polycarp himself as a presbyter. The commencement of the letter leads us to infer this: 'Polycarp and those who with him are elders.' It might possibly mean, 'Polycarp and elders who are with him,' but this is not a likely translation of the words, and certainly disagrees with the Latin translations."

[4] Harnack, op. cit., (CL), p. 81; "But it is very surprising that they are not called 'bishops' and that the name 'bishops' is entirely absent from the Epistle (see, on the other hand, the Epistle of Paul to the Philippians). We might be tempted to assume that the admonition addressed to the bishops has fallen out from its place in front of that to the deacons, since it is extremely surprising to find these put in front, but another explanation is more natural."

[5] Lake, op. cit., (AF), vol. 2, p. 3; "The Shepherd is divided into Visions (in the last of which the Shepherd appears), Commandments or Mandates, as they are more usually called, and Parables or Similitudes. It may roughly be said that in the Visions the necessity for repentance is enforced, in the Mandates the life required from the penitent is explained, and in the Similitudes the working and theological doctrine of repentance is developed. The date and provenance of the Shepherd is fixed by the list of canonical books in the Muratorian Canon, which rejects the Shepherd of Hermas, though some accepted it as a canonical apocalypse, on the ground that it was written 'quite recently, in our own time in the city of Rome, by Hermas, while his brother Pius was sitting on the

confusing work. The Shepherd brought the apostles and teachers to the forefront, for according to Vis. iii, 5 and Mand. iv, 3, some are still living.[1] Official succession is not developed.[2] An order of ministries has emerged, but is not as in other epistles of this time.

In Vision 3:5, the author speaks of apostoloi, episkopoi, didaskaloi, and diakonoi. Whether this is an order or not is questionable.[3] In the second and ninth Visions the leaders of the community (2nd Vision), and deacons (9th Vision) receives harsh treatment. The leaders (2:6) are to reform. The deacons, who must administer alms, have coveted what is for the widows and orphans; and they can only live if they repent (Sim. 26:2).[4]

Only two passages reflect on the presbyters (Vis. ii, 4:2) and (Vis. iii, 1). Each passage gives us enough information as to the function, or relationship that the presbyters have to other officers. These passages also state

---

throne of the church of the city of Rome.' Pius was Pope about 148 AD, so that the Shepherd must have been written in Rome at about that time. Many critics, however, think that it may have been written at intervals during the twenty or thirty years preceding this date, and that traces can be seen of varying dates in the three divisions of the book."

---

[1] Harnack, op. cit, (CL), p. 74f; "He does not mention the prophets in connection with these views about the foundation of the Church (Sim. lx., 15, the Old Testament prophets are meant); it is difficult to account for this omission (see my Mission and Expansion of Christianity, vol. 1, pp. 339f), since in Mand. xi., he goes very thoroughly into the question of the true and the false prophets, and he himself is a prophet."

[2] Schweizer, op. cit., p. 159; "Here too, as with Ignatius, the problem of the tradition, or indeed of official succession, is by no means completely developed; the Church is, in fact, seen much more clearly in its timeless union with Christ than in its march through history."

[3] Harnack, op. cit., (CL), p. 175; says "he connects the general with the local organization (as in the Epistle to the Ephesians) and now gives the sequence apostles, bishops, teachers and deacons;" also, Kenneth E. Kirk, The Apostolic Ministry, (Morehouse-Gorham Co, New York, 1946), p. 158; says "Hermas's phrase 'bishops, teachers, deacons,' may suggest yet another developement, according to which the teaching elder is grouped with the bishop and contrasted with the non-teaching elder."

[4] Lake, op. cit., (AF), vol. 2, p. 281; "Those with spots are ministers who ministered amiss, and devoured the living of widows and orphans, and made gain for themselves from the ministry which they had received to administer. If then they remain in the same covetousness they are dead and they have no hope of life. But if they turn and fulfil their ministry in holiness they shall be able to live."

that martyrs were more worthy than presbyters.[1] There must have been some group called the 'presbyters' because they are instructed to listen to this little book, and they are in charge of the church.

The semantical problem in this book is deeper than in the other works of the Church Fathers. There is no evidence of a monarchical episcopate.[2] The ministeries that emerge are a matter of course.[3] Presbyters have church responsibilities, deacons have to care for the poor and bishops are similar to deacons. However, the similarity between the bishop and deacon is not made clear.[4]

Many theories of organization have come from the Church Fathers, the book of Acts, and other historical documents. Circumstances varied throughout the many years of writing the New Testament. Interpretations differed also.[5]

---

[1]Goguel, op. cit., (PC), p. 154; emphasises that Hermas set up a hierarchy of martyrs, prophets and presbyters.

[2]Harnack, op. cit., (CL), p. 78; "The existence of a monarchical bishop is excluded both by the plural 'the presbyters who preside over the church' (in the one community of Rome) and the plural 'bishops.'"

[3]Schweizer, op. cit., p. 159; "A certain order of ministries has emerged, and is assumed as a matter of course; but these ministries involve no guarantee, either of the right tradition as in 1 Clement, or of the unity of the Church as in Ignatius. The co-existence of ecstatics and office-bearers, shows that although a certain competition is unavoidable, it implies a line of theological thought that is basically similar, in relation to the ordinary church members. But in Hermas this is indicated quite cautiously, and the writer is anxious to stress that what is in question here is only a certain place of honor, and not a final distinction."

[4]Goguel, op. cit., (PC), p. 155; "There were also bishops, but what they did does not seem clear; perhaps the term bishop was only a title used by certain presbyters. Apart from the fact that they had the duty of exercising hospitality, their functions seem to have been almost the same as those of the deacons; they had also to look after the poor and widows. This apparent effacement of the bishops may perhaps be due to the fact that Hermas was specially interested in the interior life of the Church, and not in its general direction and relations with the outside world, which seems to have been the essential sphere of the bishops. But he shows that episcopacy was not preponderant at Rome."

[5]J. K. S. Reid, The Biblical Doctrine of the Ministry, (Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh, 1955), p. 31.

Therefore, I will state the different major theories that have been proposed.

Not excluding the theories of Rothe,[1] Baur,[2] or Ritschl,[3] J. B. Lightfoot had the first candid study on the early church organization.[4] He stated that as the church grew in numbers, as new and heterogeneous elements were added, as the early fervor of devotion cooled and as strange forms of disorder sprang up, it became necessary to provide for the emergency by fixed rules and definite offices." Officers were appointed.[5]

Lightfoot used Ephesians 4, and 1 Corithians 12, for his proof of Paul converting believers and founding congregations. This proof was foremost, while the permanent government and instruction of the several churches was kept in the background. Great stress was laid on the work of the Spirit.

The permanent ministry gradually emerged.[6] Before the middle of the second century, each church or organized Christian community had its three orders of ministries -- its bishops, its presbyters, and its deacons. Exactly when the crystalization of these orders occurred is questionable.

The different grades of ministry, "beginning from the lowest," are created in order.[7] It is true that the seven are never actually called deacons, but the establishment of the diaconate is first because the Hellenist widows are overlooked. They are elected by popular vote and ordained.

---

[1] R. Rothe, Die Anfange der Christlichen Kirche und ihrer Verassung, (Wittenburg, 1837).
[2] F. C. Baur, Ueber den Ursprung des Episcopats in der Christlichen, (Tubingen, 1838).
[3] Albrecht Ritshl, Die Entstehung der Altkatholischen Kirche, (Bonn, 1857), 2nd edition.
[4] J. B. Lightfoot, St. Pauls Epistle to the Philippians, (MacMillan and Co., London, 1868).
[5] Ibid., p. 184.
[6] Lightfoot, op. cit., (EP), p. 186; "As the church assumed a more settled form, and the higher but temporary offices, such as the apostolate, fell away," the permanent ministry emerged.
[7] Lightfoot, op. cit., (EP), p. 187.

This office becomes the later diaconate.[1] This is a new order being established. It is not a carry over from the Hellenists,[2] the Levitical order,[3] or the synagogue, according to Lightfoot.[4] The work of the deacon was primarily relief of the poor. They might have even ministered the word.

The eldership is not a new office, but was adopted from the synagogue. Jewish elders existed in all principal cities of the dispersion.[5] On their missionary journeys Paul and Barnabas appointed elders in every church.

Concerning the term 'bishop,' it has been shown in the apostolic writings that the two (bishop and presbyter) are only different designations of one and the same office. This is true in the Gentile churches.[6]

The duties of the elders are two-fold. They are a) rulers and b) instructors, of the congregation. At the close of the apostolic age the deacon and elder are established; but traces of the third and highest order, the episcopate, are few and indistinct. It is not a continuation of the apostolate. The episcopate developes out of the eldership. In fact, in Jerusalem there might have been the equivalent of a bishop in James.[7]

---

[1] Lightfoot, op. cit., (EP), p. 188; "Though this point has been much disputed, I do not see how the identity of the two can reasonably be called in question, if the word deacon does not occur in the passage, yet the corresponding verb and substantive, διακονεῖν and διακονία, are repeated more than once."

[2] Lightfoot, op. cit., (EP), p. 189; "Some writers however have explained the incident as an extension to the Hellenists of a institution which already existed among the Hebrew Christians and is implied in the 'younger men' mentioned in an earlier part of St. Lukes history."

[3] Lightfoot, op. cit., (EP), p. 189; "The Levite, whose function it was to keep beasts for slaughter, to cleanse away the blood and offal of the sacrifices, to serve as porter at the temple gates, and to swell the chorus of sacred psalmody, bears no strong resemblance to the Christian deacon."

[4] Lightfoot, op. cit., (EP), p. 189; (his duties were confined of the building and the preparation for service).

[5] Lightfoot, op. cit., (EP), p. 193.

[6] Lightfoot, op. cit., (EP), p. 193.

[7] Lightfoot, op. cit., (EP), p. 195f; (functions of each differ widely).

In Gentile churches, two stages of development occurred. First, there was the occasional supervision by the apostles themselves; and secondly, the infrequency of the apostles' visits created an apostolic delegate in residence. Therefore, Lightfoot concludes that early in the second century the episcopal office was firmly and widely established.[1]

The formation of the secular associations had a striking influence of the formation of the early ecclesiastical order of the church, according to Edwin Hatch.[2] Yet, each Christian community was different;[3] each has its peculiarities, but brings with it some of the structure of these secular groups.

In the early church there was a body of officers known collectively and individually by names similar to Jewish and Greek folk (presbuteroi and episkopoi).[4] Hatch refers to Justin Martyr in order to explain the role played by such officers, especially the bishop.

The offerings of Christians were made privately, and a presiding officer accepted them. He was the center of the Christian system of charity. His title was episkopos, and his function was chiefly known as oikonomia, or diakonia. The finances were used by the poor, and the travelling brethren, and were distributed by the bishop. The bishop was the pivot and center of the ecclesiastical administration, and his function also includes the

---

[1] Lightfoot, op. cit., (EP), p. 201.

[2] Hatch, op. cit., (OEC), p. 26.

[3] Hatch, op. cit., (OEC), p. 36; "Other associations were charitable: but whereas in them charity was an accident, in the Christian associations it was of the essence. They gave to the religious revival which almost always accompanies a period of social strain the special direction of philanthropy. They brought into the European world that regard for the poor which had been for several centuries the burden of Jewish hymns. They fused the Ebionism of Palestine with the practical organization of Graeco-Roman civilization."

[4] Hatch, op. cit., (OEC), p. 37; "In their capacity as a governing body they were known by names which were in current use for a governing body; in their special capacity as administrators of church funds they were known by a name which was in current use for such administrators."

preservation of doctrine and the presidency of the courts of discipline.[1]

"There was probably a time in the history of the Christian Church at which these functions of administration were the functions of a single class of officers."[2] Before the apostolic age passed one finds not one class of officers, but two (episkopoi and diakonoi). They are in close relation and for the most part spoken of together. Hatch feels the office is only divided in the middle of the second or early third century.[3]

The presbyters have a different and less complex beginning. Officers continue to bear functions closely analogous to those which they had exercised in the Dispersion.[4] Even in the Gentile communities it is similar.[5] The presbyterate in the Gentile Churches have a spontaneous and independent origin. They are the bishop's council.

The presbyters main functions are: 1) they exercise discipline; and 2) they exercise a consensual jurisdiction in matters of dispute between fellow Christians. At first no single presbyter had power, then a revolution occurred. The presbyter's duties, which are essentially disciplinary and collegiate, are superseded. Then one presbyter discharges what the presbyter's functions are, which includes the "ministration of the Word and the Sacraments."[6] The presbyter can teach and administer the sacraments in worship.

---

[1] Hatch, op. cit., (OEC), p. 46.
[2] Hatch, op. cit., (OEC), p. 48; "The conception of the nature of Church office which is found in the New Testament is divisible into two parts - that of presidency and that of ministry."
[3] Hatch, op. cit., (OEC), p. 49f.
[4] Hatch, op. cit., (OEC), p. 62; "In other words, that the elders of the Jewish communities which had become Christian were, like the elders of the Jewish communities which remained Jewish, officers of administration and of discipline."
[5] Hatch, op. cit., (OEC), p. 62; "Two elements have to be accounted for: 1) the fact of government by a council or committee; 2) the fact that the members of such council or committee were known by a name which implies seniority."
[6] Hatch, op. cit., (OEC), p. 77.

Charles Gore's studies on the origin, nature and development of the Christian ministry identified two periods - the apostolic and the sub-apostolic.[1] The conception of the apostolic ministry is seen in apostolic history. The functions of the apostles were preaching, founding churches, and administering the sacraments. They were assisted by presbyters who remained assistants. They worked in co-operation with the prophets and teachers. They had in particular a missionary function.[2]

The apostles and their fellow-workers have a local ministry of 'presbyters' or 'bishops.'[3] A subordinate ministry of deacons and deaconesses is present also.[4]

In sub-apostolic times when the apostles have passed on, the churches in the West are governed by a council of presbyters who have no superiors over them, "and who therefore must be supposed to have handed on their own ministry."[5] During these sub-apostolic times the bishop is hidden in the presbyterate, and there is no monarchical episcopate.[6]

"There were traces of several primitive types of organization within the churches of the apostolic age," says T. M. Lindsay. The earliest Christian organization is found in Acts. Men were chosen as elders, not deacons, to perform a task and this was the beginning of the early church organization.[7]

---

[1] Gore, op. cit., pp. 233-36.

[2] Gore, op. cit., pp. 266-67.

[3] Gore, op. cit., p. 267; They "are appointed by the Apostles and ordained by the laying on of hands to share in some particular community the pastorate and stewardship which Christ instituted in His Church."

[4] Gore, op. cit., p. 268.

[5] Gore, op. cit., p. 334; "These presbyter-bishops legitimately 'ordained' and fulfilled episcopal functions because those functions belonged to the equal commission they had all received."

[6] Gore, op. cit., p. 335; "There was a time when they were the chief seat. But over them, not yet localized, were men either of prophetic inspiration or of apostolic authority and known character - 'prophets' or 'teachers' or 'rulers' or 'men of distinction' - who in the subapostolic age ordained to the sacred ministry and in certain cases would have exercised the chief teaching and governing authority."

The early Christian communities were largely self-governing under the guidance of the apostles. When we turn to Paul's work we find independence and self-government "evidently taken for granted and formulated in principles laid down by the apostle in his epistles."[1] The Christian fellowship is organized under social usages also,[2] and has a possible link with heathen confraternities.[3] Another root of early Christian organization is found in the Jewish synagogues of the Dispersion.[4]

The second century had marks of independence and change. The change is two-fold, and concerned both the prophetic and the local ministry.[5] The former passes away and the latter becomes more complex.

By the end of the second century the community is sharply divided into clergy and laity. "The office-bearers included the pastor (now invariably called the bishop), elders, deacons, readers, and perhaps subdeacons."[6]

---

[7]Lindsay, op. cit., pp. 115-6; "The first notice we have of organization within a local church is given us in the sixth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles when, at the suggestion of the apostles, seven men were chosen for what is called the service of tables. These men were selected and set apart to take care of the poor and to administer the charity of the congregation." ... "They were never called deacons; the 'seven' is the technical name they were known by."

---

[1]Lindsay, op. cit., p. 121; "There is not a trace of the idea that the churches had to be organized from above in virtue of powers conferred by our Lord officially and specially upon certain of their members. On the contrary the power from above, which was truly there was in the community, a direct gift from the Master Himself."

[2]Lindsay, op. cit., pp. 122-24.

[3]Lindsay, op. cit., p. 128

[4]Lindsay, op. cit., p. 129; "Many of the converts must have been Jews, or Gentiles who had become Jewish proselytes."

[5]Lindsay, op. cit., p. 169; "The 'prophetic' ministry passed away, its functions being appropriated by the permanent office-bearers of the local churches; and every local church came to supplement its organization by placing one man at the head of the community making him the president of the college of elders." The change in the local churches "consisted in placing at the head of this college of rulers one man, who was commonly called either the pastor or the bishop, the latter name being the more usual, and apparently the technical designation. The ministry of each congregation or local church instead of being, as it had been, two-fold: of elders, and deacons; became three-fold: of pastor or bishop, elders, and deacons. This was the introduction of what is called the three-fold ministry.

Lindsay uses the Canons of Hippolytus to represent this period of time in early church organization.

Apostles, prophets and teachers do not form a triple crown in Judaism, according to Adolf Harnack, but are evident from the earliest of time in the Christian Church.[1] Although, they do form a unity because they are all entrusted with speaking the word of God. The apostles were missionaries, the prophets' work was mostly in their own community, and the teachers seemed to be confined to one place. Therefore, the prophets occupy an "intermediate position between the teachers and the apostles. They were all charismatics,"[2] according to Harnack.

The second authoritative positions deals with the authority of the 'old' as opposed to the 'young.' The administration and executive power of elected officials constitutes the third operating sphere of the organization. Apostles, prophets and teachers belong to the religious sphere, the second group have their function in the field of moral education and discipline, and the elected officials have their function in service and administration. And, at a very early period, these elected officials are also involved in public worship. "All of these activities rest on charismata."[3]

---

[7]Lindsay, op. cit., pp. 246-50; "At the head stood the bishop, in whom the whole congregational life centered. He was chosen by the whole congregation, who assembled in church for the purpose . . . Nothing is said about the election of elders, and it is impossible to say whether they were chosen by the people or nominated by the bishop, or co-opted by the session." He "assisted the bishop in the conduct of public worship." The "deacon, on the other hand, is the official who does the sub-ordinate services. He is told to remember that he is the servant of God, the servant of the bishop and the servant of the elders."

---

[1]Harnack, op. cit., (CL), p. 23; "We do not know when and how the threefold division arose. It would not have developed without Jewish precedents."

[2]Harnack, op. cit., (CL), p. 24; their calling rests on a gift of the spirit.

[3]Harnack, op. cit., (CL), p. 43; "But in the proper sense, i.e., as persons only the preachers of the word are borne by the spirit. The others are brethren who have received the gift necessary to enable them to render their services."

The origin of the monarchical episcopate is to be found in the apostles. When the leading apostle slowly passed from the scene an informal monarchy began. With a leader of worship needed, and intercourse with external bodies required, the church appointed a single authoritative teacher. Therefore, the conclusion according to Harnack is that the apostle held the position that the bishop received in the later stages.

The presbyters powers remain great in so far as they acted as a college, "for here the relative equality with the bishop was maintained."[1] The deacons remained closely associated with the bishop,[2] in fact, they can even rise direct from the diaconate to the episcopate. Of course, the episcopal office weakens the position of both the presbyters and the deacons.[3]

"An evolution of church order can be traced," says B. H. Streeter. According to Streeter this church order culminates in the Johannine writings. Church order has its stimulus with Paul, and he keeps the movement going.[4] This theory differs from that of Harnack. Streeter disagrees with Harnack because he feels that what Harnack says presupposes an abstract and systematic way of looking at a concrete and ever-changing situation which he finds hard to accept as historical.

The early church to Streeter, is not modeled after Jerusalem. But, it is quite logical for Paul to view the newly founded local communities as

---

[1] Harnack, op. cit., (CL), p. 129.

[2] Harnack, op. cit., (CL), p. 129; "Their activity and powers are now confined to rendering assistance in public worship, in the care of the poor and the care of souls. Only the lower disciplinary functions can have fallen to them; with the judicial they had nothing to do."

[3] Harnack, op. cit., (CL), p. 131; "The former is deprived of the dignity attaching to the office of president; they are now no longer the presiding presbyters (οἱ πρεσβύτεροι οἱ προϊστάμενοι) in the full sense. The latter is reduced completely to the rank of higher servants."

[4] Streeter, op. cit., p. 67.

synagogues. Paul, therefore, organizes accordingly. It is the "reaction of organism" to the environment.[1] The church order, according to Streeter, undergoes a rapid evolution in response to urgent local needs, and this is followed later by standardization (up to an efficent uniform model).

Streeter cites Acts 11:30, to show that the government is the type that can be conveniently described as "non-episcopal."[3] There is the president, or bishop, whose status is higher than his fellow presbyters, and there is a body of seven who acted as almoners to the community. Yet, Jerusalem is unique.

Prophet and teacher are the titles given those of importance in the Gentile Church. This is found in Antioch and other places.
According to Streeter, even at the end of the first century, prophets and teachers existed, but not episkopoi or diakonoi.[4]

Each church founded by Paul had elders. Streeter assumes from 1 Corinthians 12;28, that diakonoi and episkopoi already existed but are of minor importance. But, when Philippians is written, the episkopoi and diakonoi were especially singled out in the salutation, which indicated importance.[5]

Streeter assumes that the administrative offices in Ephesians (Eph. 4:11-12) were equivalent to the other of the episkopoi and that the stress was no longer laid primarily on the spiritual gifts required, which is an individual matter, but on the office as such in relation to its function in the corporate life.[6] All of this makes probable the existence of a slow but

---

[1]Streeter, op. cit., p. 71.
[2]Streeter, op. cit., p. 72.
[3]Streeter, op. cit., p. 73.
[4]Streeter, op. cit., p. 76.
[5]Streeter, op. cit., p. 80.
[6]Streeter, op. cit., p. 81.

steady movement towards a state of things where importance was attached to the holding of an office invested with recognized authority.[1]

Maurice Goguel was quick to say that "we must avoid the notion that behind every fact relative to the ecclesiastical organization lies a precise theory."[2] He feels that it was neither the execution of a systematic plan nor just the simple result of chance. He argues for neither side.

The church knows of two types and two conceptions of the ministry, according to Goguel.[3] There was the charismatic ministry and the one organized and tied to a rite. These ministries differ, but do not form clear-cut categories. The charismatic ministry was more evident in the Greek Christian Community, than in Jerusalem. A charismatic ministry can be autocratic or aristocratic, and the ministers are inspired persons. The institutional ministry has a democratic conception. "Actually," says Goguel, "the early Church was neither autocratic, aristocratic, nor democratic, but 'christocratic,' the source of authority being Christ, who was equally active in the apostles, inspired persons, and the assembly of the faithful."[4]

---

[1] Streeter, op. cit., p. 83, "And it is a movement away from the state of things implied in 1 Corinthians--where preeminence in the church depends on the personal possession of some spiritual gift (of which 'government' is one of the least esteemed)."

[2] Goguel, op. cit., (PC), p. 116; "Facts often precede ideas."

[3] Goguel, op. cit., (PC),, p. 117; "On the one side there was the charismatic ministry of the Pauline Churches. All those functions of both the material and the spiritual order, which were necessary for the Church's life, were discharged by men whom God had called and fitted by a gift of the Spirit. In this conception there were no stable ministries, but only ministries which are instruments of the Spirit. In the other conception the Spirit also plays a part, but it does not act spontaneously by itself; it is organized and tied to a rite, i.e. the imposition of hands. The link between the function and the man to whom it is entrusted thus becomes closer."

[4] Goguel, op. cit., (PC), p. 118.

Insert page 69"

It is important that we consider the origin of terminology that compliments the Pastorals, as well as the background history of the Christian organization.

It becomes obvious that the Pastorals organization was strongly influenced by its environment. It is also obvious that the Acts account and the Church Fathers compliment and parrallel our feelings that these epistles are related closely to the late first and early second century. The theories of the early church organization proposed by different scholars helps pattern our thinking concerning the early ministry. Therefore this type of background gives us a beginning as to where the Pastorals stand in their early organization.

There was no great gulf between material and spiritual functions, according to Goguel. When inspiration grew rare, the rite becomes its successor.

*

Now let us consider the idea of the church and the ministry in the Pastorals. As the church asserts herself, the authority of those who exercised the ministries had to be more firmly secured. The faith began to receive doctrinal expression, and doctrine became sharply defined in opposition to heresy. Those charged with the leadership and direction of the church defended sound doctrine. This new function supports their ministry as well as the church. As the church grows so does the ministries. Their life becomes more complex and their ministry more extensive. The result is inevitable and specialized duties, functions and ministries emerge.

The first generation of leadership is charismatic. The second generation is appointed or elected. The first leaders are itinerant, but the second generation has basic responsibilities to a special community. The ministry, which at one time depends greatly upon inspiration, now looks for stable leadership from its ranks. These leaders are probably elected by their own people.

The development of the ecclesiastical organization is seen in the late first and early second century as a movement towards unification. By a process of fusion and natural selection, leaders and churches prevail. The affinity between the early churches is due to the unity of the faith which created them. Their diversity grows from their environmental background.

The establishment of a local ministry is affirmed in the Pastorals. But before going on, I will clarify my thought concerning the charismatic and elected leadership. Most scholars want to draw a line and distinguish quite sharply between them, but I suggest that we consider that the leadership of the second generation was influenced by both. In other words, one did not stop, and another start, but one complemented the other amidst the diversity of the church and its growing pains.

In the Pastorals, the ecclesiastical ministry found in the church separated it from the world. The line was drawn, the dye was cast. The church was no longer in the context of the Pauline missionary situation. The church had become like a family. It was the house of God. The church had now become the 'familia Dei,'[1] facing, as a body, the outside world. Its order became a stockade erected against its assailants.

The Pastorals picture a long extending history.[2] The church was no longer living in the expected short interval. The parousia was not just around the corner, as Paul anticipated.[3]

In the Pastorals there is an attempt to stabilize the local ministry through either correction or reform. The ministry was faced with a need to restate its convictions because of a new era and a new environment. The author provided a workable rule for people within the church. He did not intend to create a church order, but rather a usable rule for the situation in Asia Minor. The Muratorian Canon states that the Pastorals were written for ecclesiastical direction.[4]

The idea of the church in the Pastorals must be explained before moving to the organizational terminology. The importance of the Pastorals' evidence

---

[1] Ernst Kasemann, Essays on the New Testament Themes, (SCM Press, London, 1964), p. 85; "For the Church is no longer seen here in the context of the Pauline missionary situation; it is no longer the world-wide body of Christ, the dominion of that grace which has invaded the world in its total being. Rather it is the house of God, 'familia Dei,' and as such exposed to attack from outside and in need of protection."

[2] Schweizer, op. cit., p. 77; agrees with Kasemann, and shares the feeling that "here too there is reflected the picture of a church that regards itself as living, not through a short interval, but through an extending history."

[3] 1 Thessalonians 4:15; 1 Corinthians 15:51; 2 Corinthians 5:1-5; also, Schweizer, op. cit., p. 77; also, R. Bultmann, 'Exegetische Probleme des 2 Kor.,' Symbolae Upsalienses 9, 1947, p. 3f.

[4] Lindsay, op. cit., p. 140; "Ad Filemonem una, et ad Titum una, et ad Timotheum duas, pro affecto et dilectione in honore tamen ecclesiae catholice in ordinatione ecclesiastice descepline sanctificatae sunt."

is that they express ideas current in the environment where they were written. Christianity had assumed to some degree, the character of tradition.

There is no real theory of the church in the Pastorals. The word itself is only found in 1 Timothy (3:5, 3:15, 5:16). The situation is quite different from that existing in Paul's time. The church had basically come of age. It had a name and was being attacked internally and externally by false accusers. The church was at the crossroads of existence as an organized body. It was an earthly reality. All of this made it necessary to enforce discipline, which in turn demanded a rigid conception of the church and its ecclesiastical structure.

The church in these epistles had not only established itself, and taken over typical Hellenistic ideas and ethics, but it had also stabilized its future by keeping the 'truth' and passing on the 'deposit.' Therefore, the church had a close connection with its past and regarded itself as beginning to be established.

The argument with Judaism had passed. The sharp "caesura" between the preparation for salvation in the Old Testament and its fulfilment in the New Testament had vanished. The church was not determined by the right understanding and practising of the law as in Matthew.[1]

The church was not living unnoticed. People outside the church watched with curiosity. It was different from that existing in Paul's time.[2] Even Paul's idea of the whole church as the Body of Christ, which is present in

---

[1] Schweizer, op. cit., p. 78; says that here, as in Luke, the Christian church regards itself as a continuation of the Jewish tradition. "The church no longer regards itself as a developing historical factor, essentially determined by its own history. It feels its own existence much more strongly as a static one; it has established itself firmly, and is now concerned to hold on to what has been attained, and to remain as it is."

[2] Goguel, op. cit., (PC), p. 70; feels that this situation was quite different from Pauls.

Romans, Corinthians, and Ephesians is absent from the Pastorals. The Pastoral church's conquests had been with wealthy and poor. Its scheme of resistance was not one of emotion but one of stability, piety, godliness, sobermindness and goodness. Basically the early Christian church's connection with the past was one of tradition. The church was willing and able to launch into the future.

Probably the church's essential feature was to be the guarantor of the 'truth.' The 'truth' was the right doctrine.[1] Basically this was not new.[2] A tradition existed prior to this which embodied the words and deeds of Christ. Therefore, the church had the Word, or the 'truth,' and it was to guarantee its continuance. This was not difficult because of the enthusiasm of a changed heart which always shared it with another. The problem could be related to the method of guaranteeing this doctrine for society. False teaching was a reality, and these epistles are heavily engaged against these false teachers. If the church was to guarantee the 'truth,' it had to be in mission constantly to guard the 'deposit' of faith, and share the faith with others, taking care not to do this in a diluted fashion. Christ became 'Mediator' or guarantor of this 'truth' through the church.[3]

Therefore, the church's connection with the past was not lost. This was the characteristic meaning behind the word 'guarding' (1 Tim. 6:20; 2 Tim. 1:14; Tit. 1:9). The emphasis was on this term because this was the mission

---

[1] This is expressed by all the passages that stress the great importance of a right doctrine (1 Tim. 1:10, 4:1, 4:6, 4:13, 5:17, 6:3, 6:20f; 2 Tim. 2:2, 2:14, 2:16, 2:23, 3:10, 4:3; Tit. 1:9, 1:14, 2:1, 3:9f).

[2] Schweizer, op. cit., p. 79.

[3] It is very significant that Moulton and Milligan, op. cit., have given several instances of 'mesitès' being used in contemporary commercial and legal Greek in conjunction with a word for 'guarantor.'

of the church. The faith was ensured by the men who represented the connection with the past (or the apostle Paul). Timothy and Titus were entrusted with the doctrine (1 Tim. 1:11; 2 Tim. 1:11), and were to hand it on unchanged. The mission was therefore one of tradition, not succession.[1]

If the mission was to 'guard' the 'truth' and pass it on unchanged, then what was the method? This leads to a consideration of the rigid test of the church discipline. The experiences that had occurred, particularly with false doctrine, led to a church discipline. The best method of passing on an unmarked gospel was through disciplined followers. Church discipline was no longer just an act of preaching the word of God; another area was evident. Church discipline was becoming a means of managing the church in order to provide for its own purity and godliness.[2] The church had drawn a line between itself and those within it who preached a false doctrine.

The closest approach to a theory of the church in the Pastorals was found socially. It was a body understood through the ideas of social order. It was understood socially through the house and family with which it was connected. Even though the church lived in an historical tradition of being led spiritually, the Spirit played little part in giving the church life. What gave the church life was the disciplined, godly man who gave it leadership and guidance.

The church, therefore, became the model of God's family. There was of course a corresponding importance attached to its building up the Christian family. The church according to Kasemann, was "the germ-cell for God's family taken as a whole. Thus a patriarchal system took root."[3] The

---

[1] Schweizer, op. cit., p. 80; "The apostle, and only the apostle, is the guarantor of its transmission - there is no mention of a 'traditio viva.'"

[2] Schweizer, op. cit., p. 82; says that the motive for this is the salvation of its members.

[3] Ernst Kasemann, Jesus Means Freedom, (trans. by F. Clarke), (SCM Press, London, 1969), p. 96.

problem at hand was to stabilize the conditions in a chaotic environment. The procedure was painstaking and difficult, but it had to be done. What eventually emerged was the embryo of the future developed church. And the Pastorals show us this development in its early stages.

The three most important terms used in the Pastorals to express offices are episkopos (bishop), presbuteros (presbyter or elder), and diakonos (deacon).[1] The entire organizational material consists of only ten per cent of the epistles.[2] It dealt not with the church leaders' duties, but with their character. The system was assumed, and it mattered, but the men were most important. Their character and behavior stood first in the mind of the author.

Mentioned only in passing were prophets (or prophesies). 1 Timothy 1:18 speaks of prophēteias, as does 4:14. Bearers of the Spirit had no other position in the Pastorals.[3] They were referred to only in the past, but there was no reference to any present action by them. In fact, their role might have been to show that prophecy pointed out Timothy to Paul for his future work.[4]

Timothy and Titus had no official title. They both had power but under no specific title. Each was to be a model of character as well as of teaching.[5] Even though Timothy and Titus do not have specific titles, they were referred to in a manner that gave a hint about their responsibilities. Timothy was referred to as a 'minister of Christ' (1 Tim. 4:6), an 'evangelist' (2 Tim. 4:5), and a 'man of God' (1 Tim. 6:11).

---

[1] Widows, (1 Tim. 5:3f), and deaconesses are considered possibly as offices.
[2] Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 25; also, Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 27.
[3] Kummel, op. cit., p. 268; but, Philip Carrington, The Early Christian Church, vol. 1, (Cambridge at the Un. Press, 1957), p. 264; says the Pastorals "have more contact with the prophetic tradition that their sedate manner would suggest. The deterioration of the church as the advent approached was part of the apocalyptic message. The writer of the Pastorals was working on a widespread church tradition which had apocalypic connection."
[4] Lock, op. cit., p. 18.
[5] Lock, op. cit., p. 19; "Timothy is called an 'evangelist' (2 Tim. 4:5), a man of God (1 Tim. 6:11), the Lord's servant (2 Tim. 2:24); his task is one of

For Timothy to be described by the term 'minister' was very Pauline. Paul used this term to describe himself,[1] as well as other Pauline representatives.[2] In all of the passages the emphasis was on the apostolic work as a service of God or Christ.

To be an 'evangelist' was Timothy's second reference. In addition to Timothy the term evangelist only occurs in Acts 21:8, where Philip was called an evangelist, and in Ephesians 4:11 where it was included in a series of functions. In Ephesians 'evangelist' described a particular kind of worker. It carried the description of an aspect of Christian work. Possibly it was a technical name for a church worker.[3]

Timothy's last title was 'man of God,' and there is no parallel to this title in the New Testament. It might be stretching the point to call this a title, but Timothy was referred to as 'man of God,' and its uniqueness in the New Testament warrants a reference here. It could have come from the Old Testament use describing a prophet,[4] or it possibly even has a semi-mystical meaning.[5] It was Timothy's duty and business to be a 'man of God' as the

---

ministry (2 Tim. 4:5). No title is given to Titus. Thet both have power given to teach themselves, to hand on the Apostles Gospel, to control the teaching of others (1 Tim. 1:3; 2 Tim. 2:14); to ordain ministers, to exercise discipline over them 'with all authority' (1 Tim. 5:17-25; 2 Tim. 4:2; Tit. 2:15, 3:10), both for reward and for punishment; to remit penalties once inflicted (?) (1 Tim. 5:22); to regulate the roll of widows (1 Tim. 5:9);" also, Harnack, op. cit., (CL), p. 67; gives a similar listing.

---

[1] cf. Rom. 11:13; 1 Cor. 3:5; 2 Cor. 3:6, 7f, 4:1, 5:18, 6:3, 11:23; Eph. 3:7, Col. 1:23-25.

[2] Eph. 6:21, Col. 1:7, 4:7; 1 Thess. 3:2.

[3] Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 117.

[4] Parry, op. cit., p. xlix; says most scholars hesitate to see this but he feels there is a title of an office, and has Old Testament associations; and Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 76; used of prophets who act in the name of God (Dt. 33:1; 1 Sam. 2:27; 1 Kings 17:24; 2 Kings 4:7), but he reminds us it is a comprehensive term used of any who offer themselves for God's service.

[5] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 139; "An attempt has been made, with the aid of parallels from Philo, the Hermetic literature, and the 'Epistle of Aristeas,' to give the expression a semi-mystical meaning."

prophets were. The meaning of the term in its context emphasized the character of one closely related to God. His function as a 'man of God' was to promote righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, and meekness (1 Tim. 6:11).

Titus had no official title either. In fact, there was no personal reference to him except in Titus 1:4, where he was called a 'true child' or 'own son' by the author. He became a legitimate and genuine successor to Paul in his evangelistic work.

It was clear that Timothy was ordained (1 Tim. 4:14). Possibly two other passages express this event also.[1] The question is, was Timothy ordained for the work which Paul was now entrusting to him, or was this the original ordination when Timothy was chosen to be Paul's companion?

1 Timothy 4:14 can help us. This was the mention of the gift given through prophecy with the laying on of hands of the presbytery. Frere says if this is paralleled with 2 Timothy 1:6, then the established practice of ordination by one presiding authority with co-operation of others is found.[2] However, Hort argues that this referred to Paul's first choosing of Timothy as his minister (Acts 16:2);[3] but, Chase says that it may refer to Timothy's confirmation at the time of his conversion.[4] On the other hand,

---

[1]Parry, op. cit., p. xlix; also feels that 1 Timothy 4:18, and 2 Timothy 1:6, 7 refer to ordination; and Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 47; agrees.

[2]W. H. Frere, "Early Forms of Ordination," Essays on the Early History of the Church and the Ministry, H. B. Swete, editor, (MacMillan and Co., London, 1018), p. 265f; "Similarly the injunction to Timothy in 1 Tim. 5:22 (if it refers to ordination), read in conjunction with Tit. 1:5, suggests that the imposition of hands continued to form part of ordination in the practice of the subapostolic generation;" but, Falconer, op. cit., p. 76; says that presbytery is not mentioned, nor are prophetic voices, therefore, "it is not the official act but Paul's sacred relation to him that heightens the appeal."

[3]Hort, op. cit., (CE), p. 184f; but against this, Parry, op. cit., p. 1; "It must be said that the nature of the mission is itself in debate, and may be quite as reasonably be determined by the description of the ordination as by other considerations."

[4]T. F. Torrance, Consecration and Ordination, (Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh), p. 238; quotes Chase, Confirmation in the Apostolic Age, pp. 35-40.

the whole context of the epistle implied an appeal to one in an authoritative position who was probably ordained.

By combining these two passages, the following meaning becomes feasible:

> "Timothy has been carefully instructed in the faith and trained in the didaskalia which he exercised, in that training it was clear that he was called to the ministry, that the Word had imparted to a gift for its ministry; at the same time that gift was regarded as imparted formally through the act of laying on of hands, authorising him as an accredited teacher and minister, but used by God as the means of imparting to him a spiritual gift from God, a charisma for the ministry; the act of laying on of hands was carried out by Timothy's teacher, Paul, and by the Presbytery acting together."[1]

Therefore, the conclusion is that Timothy's ordination occurred with Paul and other elders presiding. It probably took place prior to his coming to Ephesus, but it did not have to be when he was called to be Paul's companion. The emphasis should be that he was called to be God's companion. The imparting of the Spirit played the strongest role in ordination.

Without generalizing too extensively, we may say that Timothy and Titus had a duty to be what was expected of such a leader and organizer. 2 Timothy 1:7 expresses the author's view as to what Timothy ought to be:

> "... for God did not give us a spirit of timidity but a spirit of power and love and self-control."

Possibly Timothy's "besetting sin" was timidity, and this was the way the author dealt with it.[2] The negative emphasis served to heighten the positive. Timothy was not to be fearful or timid, but was to be one with power, love, and of a sound mind or self control. All three words characterized the attitude of God's minister in dealing with others.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 238; says that Professor Daube suggests that the laying on of hands probably refers to a rabbinic term for 'the ordination of elders,' but it seems more likely to be the Presbytery as a whole laid on hands.

[2] Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 126.

This 'power' was due primarily to the consciousness of authority from God; but its effectiveness depended on its first being shown in our dealings with ourselves. It was only by acting vigorously and courageously that one found out the full power of the Spirit.[1] This was a power that was stronger than any other power.[2]

This 'love' represented the restraining influence in his exercise of authority. This was especially needed against the false accusers. It was a love of concern, which corrected hardness, yet struck the note of service to man in an empathetic way.

Then the passage closed with the personal requisite of 'self-control' for each Christian if he was to remain as such. This was an opposite to the kind of temperament which was ready to compromise for the sake of peace and quietness.[3] This dealt with Timothy's treatment of himself, but also included his response to men. One had to have an active control of himself in the face of panic or passion.[4]

These three virtues are virtues of authority. But one cannot let them get out of control. For 'love' and 'discipline' control the exercise of 'power.'

Timothy's duties were varied. He was to exercise discipline over other leaders (or ministers) (1 Tim. 5:17-25), preach the Word (2 Tim. 4:2), regulate the roll of widows (1 Tim. 5:9), and control the teaching of others (1 Tim. 1:3; 2 Tim. 2:14).

---

[1] Alfred Plummer, The Pastoral Epistles, (Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1888), p. 316.

[2] Lock, op. cit., p. 86; parallels this with Romans 1:16, and says it emphasizes a power stronger than the "Empire of power."

[3] A. E. Hillard, The Pastoral Epistles, (Rivingtons, London, 1919), p. 72.

[4] Falconer, op. cit., p. 76.

Titus had similar responsibilities. He was to set in order the things that were wanting (Tit. 1:5), ordain elders (Tit. 1:5), speak with authority (Tit. 2:15), and possibly even punish (Tit. 3:10). He was to organize new missions in Crete, but was to leave when this work was done.

Both Timothy and Titus followed Paul and therefore became the orthodox bearers of the Word.[1] The primitive Christian view that said every Christian received the Spirit in his baptism, fell into the background. It is difficult to reconcile this state of affairs with the Pauline doctrine of the charismata.[2] In other words, he who stood over against the rest of the community was now the real bearer of the Spirit.

There were grades of the local ministry in the Pastoral Epistles and each assumed different functions. The question that had to be tackled first, was one dealing with the general term 'presbyters' (or elders). If presbyter dealt always with a designation of age there would be no problem.[3] This is not the case. So, then, are the presbyters and episkopos the same,[4] or not?

---

[1] Schweizer, op. cit., p. 83; and Harnack, op. cit., (CL), p. 66; calls them representatives of the apostle during his absence.

[2] Kasemann, op. cit., (E), p. 87; "...for all practical purposes it disappears."

[3] 1 Timothy 5:1 and Titus 2:2, show a definite distinction because of age not title, but this is not the case always.

[4] Lindsay, op. cit., p. 366; says they mean "in the primitive church absolutely the same thing;" also, Schweizer, op. cit., p. 85; also, Harnack, op. cit., (CL), p. 67; states that "as the somewhat tautological text runs, the bishop seems to be identical with the presbyter, and must therefore be understood in a plural sense;" also, Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 25; says the terms describe the same people; also, Hort, op. cit., (EC), p. 189f; also, Streeter, op. cit., p. 99; "The terms episkopos and Presbyter are still, to some extent, interchangeable, but the use of them is probably designated ambiguous in order that the advice given may be appropriate to churches which had not, as well as those which had, adopted a monarchical rule;" also, Parry, op. cit., p. 61; "The conclusion is that this Epistle (and confirmed in Titus) shows us one class of officers name πρεσβύτεροι whose business of government is described by the verb ἐπίσκοπή , and who could therefore themselves be described as ἐπίσκοποι , whether that was a second title of their office or, as Hort maintains, at this time merely a description of their function;" also Kummel, op. cit., p. 268; "The Pastorals probably designate with episkopos and presbuteros the same office;" also, Lock, op. cit., p. 19; also, Lightfoot, op. cit., (CEP), p. 95f; also, Loening, Die Gemeindever fassung des Urchristeuthums, 1889, p. 58f; also, F. Loofs, Studien und Kritiken, (Leipzig, 1890), p. 629f; and, Gore, op. cit., p. 219.

On the other hand, the bishop is always referred to in the singular (probably to be taken in the generic sense),[1] and may refer to the monarchical episcopate,[2] 'jure divino.'[3] In virtue of the spirit imparted to him, the 'bishop' became the connecting link between the apostle and the future monarchical bishop. And without stretching the point too far, this could be said of the two apostolic delegates, Timothy and Titus. Yet, if one is not ready to consider this office as a monarchical episcopate, then this office of bishop is either a second title or descriptive of the presbyter.[4] The

---

[1] Lock, op. cit., p. 20; states that the definite article is prefixed (τὸν ἐπίσκοπον, 1 Tim. 3:2; Tit. 1:7); Falconer, op. cit., p. 56; "The occupant of the office is mentioned only in the singular. Probably the article is generic, denoting a member of a class;" also, Streeter, op. cit., p. 114f; takes the singular to be generic; also, Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 26; feels that these singular references are to be interpreted in a generic sense, "i.e. of the class of bishops, and no deduction can be made from this detail;" also, Hanson, op. cit., (C), p. 16f; states that this is vague concerning why it is in the singular; "the simplest explanation is that the author knew that there had been no bishops in Paul's day," but they emerged in his day, and he speaks vaguely of them.

[2] Streeter, op. cit., p. 114f; sees Timothy and Titus as idealized portraits of the established monarchical episcopate. "Timothy and Titus are character sketches of the ideal bishop;" also v. Campenhausen, Kirchliches Amt und geistliche Vollmacht in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten, (Tubingen, 1963), p. 116f; also, T. G. Jalland, The Origin and Evolution of the Christian Church, (Hutchinsons Un. Library, London, 1948), p. 88.

[3] Kasemann, op. cit., (E), p. 87f; argues from 2 Timothy - "We may assert that the apostolic delegate is regarded in the Pastorals as the connecting link between apostle and monarchical bishop and as the prototype of the latter. In other words he stands in the apostolic succession in precisely the same way as the Jewish rabbi standing in the succession from Moses and Joshua receives the tradition corpus of instruction and the accepted exposition of the law and administers them 'jure divino' - that is in virtue of the spirit imparted to him through ordination." Those against such assertions are Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 25; says there is nothing in these letters to suggest that the bishop was in sole charge of any one community; also, Falconer, op. cit., p. 56; also, Schweizer, op. cit., p. 85; suggests that the likely explanation is that the writer inserted a traditional exhortation for a bishop.

[4] Hort, op. cit., (CE), p. 190; feels it is erroneous to call it a second title. "In Acts 20, Paul used episkopos as descriptive, not as a second title, so that we might render it 'set you to have oversight.'" Its the same in Titus, only clearer. "If episkopos is a title of office, the article before it without motive, and ἀνέγκλητον εἶναι following it is a time repetition when εἴ τις ἐστὶν ἀνέγκλητος has preceded. But taken descriptively it supplies a link which gives force to every other word; also, Gore, op. cit., p. 219; states it may mean the same title but not a position to be pressed.

latter seems most feasible. 'Presbyter' is probably the title coming from the analogy of the Jewish synagogue, and 'bishop' would be descriptive of their function.[1]

Although it is not a closed case, it seems that the bishop and presbyter defined the same office which was not yet monarchical; unless, however, Timothy and Titus represent this.[2] The bishop's title was descriptive, not a second title,[3] which could explain the use of the singular also. The bishop was the 'overseer' and represented the presbyters.[4] His responsibility was greater than the others; yet, he still was a presbyter.

The deacon's office causes more concern. His qualities were similar to those of the bishop. His position was defined in his name.[5] He was definitely in the role of service, and serving others.[6] It seems that he had a recognized title among the Christians at Ephesus; and yet, he was not mentioned at Crete.

Looking at the deacon's office, there is question as to where this ministry fits in with the presbyters. He may be of a lower ministry than the

---

[1] Lock, op. cit., p. 20; states that if these are two different titles for one status, then 'presbyters' is the title (coming from the analogy of the Jewish synogogue), and 'bishops' would be descriptive of their function as taking oversight. This is strongly supported by Acts 20:17, and Acts 20:28.

[2] Easton, op. cit., p. 177; refers to Timothy and Titus, the Ignatian bishops are actually found in everything but the title; (this is pure speculation).

[3] Lock, op. cit., p. 20; explains that the title would have to be the 'presbyters,' springing out of the analogy of the Jewish Synagogue, "a small group of leading men chosen by the founder of each church to manage its affairs after he had gone."

[4] Perhaps the presbyters did not discharge the same duties. In fact Goguel, op. cit., (PC), p. 133; says that the term 'bishop' might have been used for those "who specialized in some particular form of activity."

[5] Parry, op. cit., p. 60; feels the offices of functions were two-fold, "one involving ἐπισκοπή, government, the other διακονία, service."

[6] Hort, op. cit., (EC), p. 203; To the Greek ears the word "almost always seems to suggest relatively low kinds of offices, whether rendered to a master, or to a state."

presbyter.[1] This assumption has been taken from the passage dealing with his 'good standing' (1 Tim. 3:13). If we look at the word translated 'standing' (bathmos), which literally means 'base,' 'foundation,' 'stair,' or 'step,' we see that it could denote a beginning or a continuation. Figuratively, it could denote a degree of advancement, or in religion "a stage in the souls growth in knowledge (so in Clement of Alexandria), or in its heavenly progress (so in the Corpus Hermeticum)."[2]

If the meaning were a lower ministry then deacons could aspire to a higher one if they were in 'good standing.' If the meaning was spiritual then he could have aspired spiritually. He could have attained a closer relationship to God. But why does it have to be 'either-or?' Could it not mean both? Was not the church looking for spiritual depth as well as leadership? And would it not have been realistic to have both qualities in one figure?[3]

Whatever church order is possessed in the Pastorals,[4] it is pure speculation to come to a conclusion concerning it. It is the character of these men that make the Pastorals so valuable concerning leadership. It is not their order or function that prevails, but what it took to make a bishop,

---

[1]Schweizer, op. cit., p. 86; states that "the 'good standing' that they can acquire is not a higher office, as for instance, that of a bishop, as one certainly might infer from Jewish and early Catholic analogies if it were not excluded by the context, but is their position before God, or perhaps their prestige in the church;" Lock, op. cit., p. 20; disagrees, and says that they may aspire to a higher office, such as the presbyterate.

[2]Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 84f.

[3]Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 85; says it does not mean either - "the apostle is thinking of the repute and influence the deacons will have with the congregation; his encouragement to them is parallel to his description of the overseers office as a 'worthwhile job.'"

[4]Carrington, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 270; states that the church order is a Palestinian one which had reached Asia Minor by way of Antioch and Caesarea; "and Acts presented pictures of this Palestinian church order as to provide models for the churches of Asia Minor;" also, Schweizer, op. cit., p. 85; states the Palestinian tradition can be traced (especially the elders).

presbyter, or deacon a strong character physically, spiritually and mentally.

In addition to the men, there were women in positions of office or authority.[1] Even though Judaism still considered women inferior, they had their place in society; but a woman's place had its boundaries. They had a certain rank of dignity if they adhered to their position in society. It was like a paradox, on the one hand there was the well known saying of the synagogue service, 'Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the Universe, who hast not made me a woman;' yet, on the other hand, there were the lofty words concerning womanhood in the Proverbs.[2]

The Old Testament often "espouses the cause of the widow and the orphan." God is referred to as the judge of widows. The Mosaic law pronounces a curse on those who afflict widows. The 'leviratis' helped to protect the rights of a widow. However, the protection had a loophole in favor of the

---

[1] 1 Timothy 5:3-16; "Honor widows who are real widows. If a widow has children or grandchildren, let them first learn their religious duty to their own family and make some return to their parents; for this is acceptable in the sight of God. She who is a real widow, and is left all alone, has set her hope on God and continues in supplications and prayers night and day; whereas she who is self-indulgent is dead even while she lives. Command this, so that they may be without reproach. If anyone does not provide for his relatives, and especially for his own family, he has disowned the faith and is worse than an unbeliever. Let a widow be enrolled if she is not less than sixty years of age, having been the wife of one husband; and she must be well attested for her good deeds, as one who has brought up children, shown hospitality, washed the feet of the saints, relieved the afflicted, and devoted herself to doing good in every way. But refuse to enroll younger widows; for when they grow wanton against Christ they desire to marry, and so they incur condemnation for having violated their first pledge. Besides that, they learn to be idlers, gadding about from house to house, and not only idlers but gossips and busybodies, saying what they should not. So I would have younger widows marry, bear children, rule their households, and give the enemy no occasion to revile us. For some have already strayed after Satan. If any believing woman has relatives who are widows, let here assist them; let the church not be burdened, so that it may assist those who are real widows."

[2] C. C. Ryrie, The Place of Women In the Church, (The MacMillan Co., New York, 1958), p. 8.

man, which resulted in neglect of the widows, and many were left to make their own way. This in turn resulted in a Jewish fund in the Temple for the purpose of relief to widows and orphans.[1] By the time of the early Christian church, many widows came under the church's care. The Christian church could not turn its back on them so they supported them. The practice of giving relief seemed to have started shortly after Pentecost. The churches had assumed this responsibility, and in turn, those who were cared for acquired some type of status as workers.[2] Obviously, in the Pastorals, these widows had become a problem. Therefore, the author recommended that only women who were unlikely to marry again should be considered as real widows. The younger were expected to marry.

An order of widows emerged.[3] Even though it was strange to Paul,[4] it was not strange to the Pastorals. No other place in the New Testament supported such an order.[5] It seems that their task was continual prayer, and it was quite important to the church because we hear as much about the widows as we do about the bishops. What is said in 1 Timothy 5 justifies the supposition that 'widows' formed a recognized group in the church and had to follow

---

[1] Ryrie, op. cit., p. 81.

[2] Riddle, op. cit., p. 204.

[3] Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 30; argues that this is doubtful to be an order of widows; "The earliest unambiguous use of 'deaconess' as a distinctive office appears in the 'Didascalia' 3:12, 13, but a wide gap separates this office from the references in the Pastorals to widows;" Goguel, op. cit., (PC), p. 135; disagrees; also C. T. Craig, The Beginnings of Christianity, (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1943), p. 278; and Lock, op. cit., p. 20, feels there was an order of women.

[4] Kummel, op. cit., p. 269.

[5] Romans 16:1, mentions Phoebe as a διάκονος; but it is used in terms of service in general. Easton, op. cit., p. 185; agrees to that; Jalland, op. cit., p. 117, disagrees and says it is not an office in the Pastorals. Schweizer, op. cit., p. 200; "This seems to be the only legally verifiable condition for a ministry in the New Testament. Elsewhere, nothing seems to be presupposed but gifts of the Spirit (as in the case of the widow of 1 Tim. 5:3f) which are apparent only to a spiritual δοκιμάζειν."

a strict rule to even be considered a 'real widow.'[1]

Possibly there were even deaconesses[2] in the Pastorals (1 Tim. 3:11). There was no mention of the bishop's wife; however, there was a reference to either the deacon's wife, or to 'female deacons.'[3] 1 Tim. 3:11 specifically speaks of the deacon's wife which does not mean deaconesses on the surface. Possibly this is the inference, but it is a question that should be left open.[4]

Since the church order that existed in the Pastorals did so because of necessity, then it was most important to find the right 'character' for the leadership role. The community rallied around the teacher, and his authority depended upon the exemplary quality of his character in daily life. And, as Kasemann has stated, it was in the ministerial spirit,[5] backed by this judgement of character that the community looked for guidance.

The office of bishop was a noble task to which to aspire (1 Timothy 3:1); but, if the bishop failed at home, within his own household, he probably could not care for God's church (3:5). There was a list of requirements of what he must be,[6] and a list of what he must not be.[7] Some of the virtuous

---

[1] Schweizer, op. cit., p. 86; states their service is one of intercession; yet J. Muller-Bardorff, "Zur Exegese von 1 Tim. 5:3-16," Festgabe fur E. Fascher, 1959, pp. 113f; states it also dealt with complet sexual abstinance; and Harnack, op. cit., (CL), p. 67; says widows "are entrusted with some function in the community," and "receive their maintenance from the treasury of the community."

[2] 1 Timothy 3:11 refers to wives of deacons; yet, Falconer, op. cit., p. 62; feels that these women are probably not wives of the deacons but deaconesses, "though probably some deaconesses may have been wives of deacons;" also Lock, op. cit., p. 20.

[3] Schweizer, op. cit., p. 86; says verse 11 is more probably related to female deacons than to deacons wives. . ."that is supported by Romans 16:1 and Hermas, Vis. II, 4:3."

[4] Spicq, op. cit., p. xlvii.

[5] Kasemann, op. cit., (E), p. 87.

[6] 1 Timothy 3 states that a bishop must be 'above reproach,' 'husband of one wife,' 'temperate,' 'sensible,' 'dignified,' 'hospitable,' 'apt teacher,' 'manage his household well,' 'keeping his children submissive and respectable in every way,' 'well thought of by outsiders;' Titus 1:5f adds to the list a few extra qualities: 'blameless,' 'lover of goodness,' 'master of himself,' 'upright,' 'holy ' 'self-controled,' 'hold firm to sure word taught.'

qualities were prominent in Greek ethics.[1] These lists strictly dealt with the character of the bishop, not his ability to lead, but his ability to be an example.

His relation to the church was like that of a father to his family (1 Tim. 3:4).[2] The bishop was left in charge of the house of God, as the house-steward.[3] He should have control of himself and hold firm to the faith that had been taught him. The bishop in turn should be apt to teach. Also, he had a responsibility to the outside world (1 Tim. 3:7), to be hospitable and well thought of. He was a representative to the community; what they saw in him, they saw in the faith, the church and Christianity.

Presbyters, or elders, had specific characteristics also (aside from these of the bishop). The presbyter was not mentioned with a list of qualifications but was an assumed office. No deacon was associated with the presbyter, as he was with the bishop. The presbyter's function and office was honorable, and if he ruled well, he was considered worthy of double honor,[4] especially if

---

[7]1 Timothy 3 states that a bishop must not be a 'drunkard,' 'violent,' 'quarrelsome,' 'lover of money,' 'a recent convert,' and Titus 1:5f adds to this list of 'nots:' 'arrogant,' 'quick-tempered,' 'greedy for gain.'

---

[1]Falconer, op. cit., p. 57; reminds us that the differences between the two epistles in qualifications are qualities prominent in Greek ethics.

[2]Lock, op. cit., p. 20.

[3]Carrington, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 266; says this the counterpart in the Pauline mission of the faithful and wise servant in the parables of Jesus who is left by the master in control of all his property.

[4]Presbyters must have received support. Parry, op. cit., p. 34; suggests that the honor includes an honorarium, "and this is also perhaps suggested by the quantitative adjective διπλῆς . On the other hand, the word τιμή is more commonly used of 'price' than of anything like wages. It is difficult to suppose that all presbyters were paid at this time;" and Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 64; mentions that no slight on the other elders is implied, but that "there would be some who admittedly did the work which entailed most time and exertion, and they had a right not only to more recompense, but to more esteem;" yet, Hanson, op. cit., (C), p. 62; refers to this passage as one referring not to a regular salary, "but to gifts presented from time to time to the presbyter or bishop by his congregation;" and Carrington, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 268; says the word 'honor' has the meaning of financial recognition. He therefore concluded that all the elders were on pension; but those who were members of the 'praesidium' could receive twice as much, especially if they

he labored in preaching and teaching. A charge against an elder was only to be made in the presence of two or three witnesses (1 Tim. 5:19).

Deacons[1] were likewise required to fulfill a standard set by the author of the epistle. The deacon had similar requirements to those of the bishop.[2] In fact, the only difference was that the bishop's list was longer than that of the deacon.

The deacon should be tested to see if he was blameless, and if blameless, he must seek to serve well because he can gain a good standing for himself (1 Tim. 3:13),[3] and great confidence in the faith. His responsibility does not appear to be one of teaching as is the case with the bishop or elder.

A widow, not less than sixty years of age, and who has had only one husband, could join the enrolled list of widows.[4] A widow had to have had a good background; she must be well attested for her good deeds, she must have

---

preached or taught. (This does not seem possible).

---

[1]Deacons are only mentioned in 1 Timothy 3:8f.

[2]1 Timothy 3:8f states that a deacon should be: 'serious,' 'hold the mystery of the faith with a clear conscience,' 'tested first' (which is to see if they are 'blameless'), 'husbands of one wife,' 'manage their children and households well.' The things they should not be: 'double-tongued,' 'addicted to much wine,' 'greedy for gain.'

[3]Parry, op. cit., p. 62; feels this passages relates to ranks within the Christian community. "But a deacon, even if he were to discharge his official duties well, would not necessarily advance to the bishopric, for he might have the gift neither for teaching nor for high administration."

[4]It appears that most scholars accept an Order of Widows (Lock, Ryrie, Craig, Goguel, Hanson, Schweizer, Kummel). Yet Lindsay, op. cit., p. 147; only calls it a ministry of women; also, Harnack, op. cit., (CL); refers to widows as entrusted with some function in the community; also, Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 102; There is good reason to doubt whether there is an order, but they play a special role in the early church and there is no reason to speculate an order here. An enrolled list of widows existed, and the conditions limited the number; Hanson, op. cit., (C), p. 59; also, Lock, op. cit., p. 21; "The writers aim is to limit this list. It is possible that those on the list were used for deeds of kindness to others, but this is not clearly stated. The main purpose of the order was eleemosynary;" also, Goguel, op. cit., p. 135.

brought up children, practiced hospitality, washed the feet of saints,[1] and relieved the afflicted. This sounds more like a list of deeds to get into a position that would offer assistance, rather than qualifications for a future job in the Christian community.

Nestled between the monarchical episcopate assumed in Ignatius and the primitive organization of Paul's evangelism are the Pastoral Epistles. They represent the churches in transition, before they passed out of their missionary phase into autonomy and independence.[2]

Ecclesiastically it appears the Pastoral Epistles have the following order or structure. There are two classes of leaders: presbyters and deacons. The presbyters (or elders) constitute the largest body. The bishop is a presbyter who has been appointed as an official head of the presbyters. His title is descriptive of his function as overseer. The deacons constitute the smaller of the official bodies.

At this specific point in church history, the church was in transition from a purely charismatic ministry to an elected ministry. Therefore, it is most difficult to pin-point any definite structure other than what is shown in the Pastorals. These epistles do not represent the monarchical episcopate

---

[1] Barrett, op. cit., p. 76; suggests that this reference to hospitality suggests the practice of washing feet, but the practice itself suggests humility in service. He further suggests that the author was familiar either with John 13:14 or had heard some oral tradition to the same effect.

[2] Carrington, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 256; explains that "there is no suggestion in these epistles that the churches will be guided into autonomy; and we have no contemporary evidence which tells us how this autonomy was achieved. All we can see is that it was completed and well established before the visit of Ignatius of Antioch to Asia Minor about 115, by which time every city had its single bishop with a council of elders and presbyters as we may call them indifferently, using either the English or the Greek world." (Carrington uses this to date the Pastorals around 80-85, and feels this system and change took place no later than the nineties).

found in Ignatius. But they do show us that one person was lifted by the community as the overseer. The person was the bishop and acquired the right to speak for the community.

The deacon had a role that seems to be unexplained; yet, his character had to be as strong as the bishop. The word itself implies service. As has been seen, in its origin this was a service of love, possibly subordinate, and definitely for others.[1]

Established in the Pastorals was the idea that the bearer of the Spirit may have a position of administration, not teaching or preaching. The positions of the preparers of the Word were just as important as the proclaimers because there was a need to battle against the false doctrine and false teachers (1 Tim. 3:2; 2 Tim. 2:2; Tit. 1:9).

The active part of the congregation, as far as responsibility was concerned, was in the background.[2] The church had established itself in the world, widows were on roll, false teachers were evident, and the congregational situation had established itself.

Part of the reason that character was stressed more than function was because the church was meeting the situation with the strongest force they had - the depth of the Christian faith. It became the defense against the false teaching and provided ecclesiastical order for the structure and on-going duty of the church.

Nowhere does the ekklesia have a greater emphasis as a household than in the Pastorals. Even though the ekklesia is only mentioned directly in

---

[1] Parry, op. cit., p. 60; insists this is a second class of assistants, who have to answer to the first class.

[2] The point here is not to distinguish or make any distinction between clergy and laity, but to raise the thought that the responsibility is in the hands of a few, not the total congregation. Kummel, op. cit., p. 269; agrees and feels that it is quite questionable whether the Pastorals presuppose the distinction between clergy and laity.

1 Timothy 3:5, 15, and 5:15, it is assumed as a household of the faith, and its leaders as parents and servants of this household. The idea of the whole church as the Body of Christ, which is a dominant conception in the epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, and Ephesians, is absent in the Pastorals. A developed thought of the church does exist in these epistles.[1]

The ministry in the Pastorals was a chief weapon in combating error and defending the faith. Its organization helped support the strength of the church. For the church was a local unit, a household.

Each community had governing men who guarded the church's doctrine. They were to uphold the moral standards and be responsible leaders. These leaders represented the church, and must be people of good reputation. Spiritual exaltation was declining, moral deficiencies appear; therefore, there was a need for strong moral leadership.

---

[1] Although this is true, Falconer, op. cit., p. 52; observes "none the less, that each unit and its officials are representative of a larger whole."

SECTION THREE: WORSHIP

The most complete expression of the early church's religion was in its worship. Worship became to the Christian an essential force of conservation. It was in the church's worship that the Word was shared, proclaimed and witnessed at its learning level. Worship had a mystical function, a didactic function as well as a symbolic function.[1]

Worship was the "life-giving center" of the early congregation.[2] It was to it that the seeker came for instruction and then went out to share what he had learned. It was also within this context that the worshipper publicly glorified God.

Worship in the early Christian Church dealt with the totality of man. It was not confined to outward ceremonies.[3] By and large, worship was considered generally as a continual form of the Christian attitude, but specifically as an outward expression of our love of God. This was the expression of one's faith. One's faith was maintained through an outward and visible expression of his feelings and this was achieved in the early church through worship. Therefore, worship was the response of man's whole nature.

One cannot speak about Christian worship without touching upon the

---

[1] Goguel, op. cit., (PC), p. 257.

[2] Wilhelm Hahn, Worship and Congregation, (John Knox Press, Richmond, Va., 1959), p. 9; "The life of the congregation and its worship must be brought into the closest relationship with one another, for its worship, in which the Word is proclaimed and the Sacraments are administered, is the life-giving center of the congregation."

[3] Craig, op. cit., p. 278; "Worship was not confined to outward ceremonies, but the entire life was man's offering to God. Therefore Paul could exhort the believers at Rome to present their bodies as a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which was their spiritual service. The writer to the Hebrews states that the sacrifices with which God is pleased are 'to do good and to share what you have.' James defined pure worship as visiting the fatherless and widows in their affliction and keeping oneself unspotted from the world."

Jewish background of worship. Christian worship had its relationships, its harmony and its uniqueness, as compared to Jewish worship.

The Temple was the center of Jewish national life. In the Temple worship, Israel found a communal satisfaction. Within the 'Mishna' and the 'Gemara,' one saw the place it held in the minds of the Jews.[1]

The Temple staff was very large. Josephus told us that it was around twenty four thousand souls in his day (Vita, i, 1). There were twenty-four main divisions which were broken up into subdivisions.[2] Each division was presided over by a leader. Those outside Jerusalem assembled in their respective synagogues. Prayer and scripture reading took place in unity, at least in spirit, with what was taking place in the Temple.[3] Hence it was only a small fraction of people that took part in Temple rites.[4]

The personnel of the Temple was composed of numerous offices. There was the high priest, the priests and Levites, treasurers, porters, special functionaries and musicians.[5] They were very numerous and were also divided into twenty-four courses.[6]

The Temple had the "prestige of antiquity of divine institution, of metropolitan position, of imposing buildings, and impressive ritual."[7] It was a busy place to which all people could go, but each limited as to how far he

---

[1] C. Guignebert, The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus, (trans. by S. H. Hooke), (Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1939), p. 59.

[2] Emil Schurer, A History of the Jewish People, vol. 1, (trans. by S. Taylor and P. Christie), (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1885), p. 221; If we may trust the Talmudic tradition, "the number of those subdivisions ranged from five to nine for each main division."

[3] W. O. E. Oesterley, The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy, (Oxford at the Clarendon Press), 1925, p. 37.

[4] Guignebert, op. cit., p. 59.

[5] Schurer, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 254f.

[6] Guignebert, op. cit., p. 60.

[7] Nathanial Micklem, Christian Worship, (Oxford Un. Press, 1936), p. 35.

could proceed into the Temple area. The Temple yard or court was a great place for teaching.

The service, even in Christ's time, was grand and solemn. The priests and Levites were on hand to carry out the services according to a designated plan. On great feasts, the high priest appeared to perform his service with great dignity.[1]

The Law was central in the Temple worship. "The pietas Judaica consisted in devotion and obedience to the Law. The sacrificial system itself formed a part of, and was secondary to, the Law which ordained it."[2] Even though this was true, the sacrifices and sacrificial acts played a significant role in the Temple. From the time of Josiah sacrifices could be offered only in the Temple.

The central life of the Temple was the daily sacrifice which was publicly offered to Yahweh morning and evening. "It was accompanied by a lengthy and imposing ceremonial, following a detailed ritual, and was accompanied by many private sacrifices."[3] Leviticus 1-7 names burnt-offerings, meat-offerings, peace-offerings, sin-offerings and trespass-offerings as the leading kinds of sacrifices made. The sacrifice was what linked the celebrant with his God. But since there were so many Jews who could not participate in such Temple services, the synagogue was their place of worship.

The synagogue was created by post-exilic Judaism for the custom of

---

[1] Josef A. Jungmann, The Early Church, (Darton, Longman and Todd, London, 1959), p. 10; "Day after day prayers and sacrifices were offered up; every prescription of the law was fulfilled in minutest detail."

[2] Kenneth E. Kirk, The Study of Theology, (Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1939), p. 411.

[3] Guignebert, op. cit., p. 60.

reading the scripture on the Sabbath day.[1] Philo said the synagogue was the 'house of instruction,' in which philosophies were studied, and every kind of virtue taught.[2] It was the link between the scribes and the people.[3]

The synagogue's origin is difficult to trace. The word synagogue means assembly.[4] Josephus described the synagogue by its chief function. He said it was a place where men congregated on the Sabbath.[5] Many theories have arisen as to its origin,[6] but this is not my point in this paper. The synagogue probably became a permanent institution in the period of the Bablylonian captivity, when a place for worship and instruction became necessary.[7]

The Jewish synagogue was not a rival to the Temple, nor was it a

---

[1]Schurer, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 54; reminds us that the main object of these Sabbath day assemblies was not public worship in the strictest sense but religious instruction, and this was for an Israelite, instruction in the law.

[2]Colson, op. cit., (Vita Mosis, ii, 27; Mang, ii, 168), p. 515f.

[3]Hastings, op. cit., p. 803.

[4]Guignebert, op. cit., p. 73; "It has several equivalents in the language of Hellenized Judaism, which means the 'assembly,' or the community, as well as the synagogue....The Palestinian word is 'keneseth,' including both the place and the gathering held there:" and C. F. D. Moule, Worship in the New Testament, (Lutterworth Press, London, 1961), p. 10; "The Jewish Synagogue (an institution of obscure origin, but perhaps dating virtually from the time of the exile) was in essence simply a 'gathering together' (which is what the Greek, συναγωγή means), of a local group to hear the scriptures read aloud, to praise God and to pray to Him together, and to be instructed."

[5]Ralph Marcus, Josephus, (Ant. xvi, 62), vol. 8, (William Heinemann, London, 1943), p. 233.

[6]Colson, op. cit., (Philo, Vita Mos, iii, 27), p. 515f; says it started with Moses himself; and L. Friedlander, Synagoge und Kirche in ihren Anfangen, (Berlin, 1908), p. 53f; says it was the creation of Hellenized Judaism; and J. Wellhausen, Israelitsche und judische Geshichte, (Berlin, Reiner, 1895), p. 193; says it dates from the Exile and arose in Babylon; and F. C. Burkitt, Christian Worship, (Cambridge at the Un. Press, 1930), pp. 10f; "From Josiah, sacrifices were to be offered at the Temple in Jerusalem (621 BC). Some felt now a division from God, not present at village sacrifices. Then Nebuchaduzzar came along and eliminated sacrifices and Jews found they could still speak without sacrifices. These associations for worship without sacrifice were called 'synagogues,' i.e., 'gatherings.'"

[7]Isidore Singer, editor, The Jewish Encyclopedia, vol. 2, (Funk and Wagnalls, New York, 1905), p. 619.

substitute or rival to the sacrificial system.[1] Basically the synagogue was a link with the Temple. Or as one scholar has said it was a complement to the Temple.[2] However, the synagogue was not a temple, for the Gentile could attend even though he was restricted.[3]

Besides elders, who had general direction of the affairs of the synagogue, there were special officers for specific purposes. None of these officers dealt specifically with public worship, for this was done by the members of the congregation.[4] There was a 'ruler' of the synagogue at the head. Other officers were under him - the receiver of alms, who had nothing to do with public worship, but was basically regarded as a civil official, and the 'minister,' whose job was to bring forth the Holy Scriptures at public worship, and was in every respect the servant of the congregation.[5]

It took at least ten men to constitute a synagogal religious assembly.[6] These religious assemblies involved "no bloody sacrifices, no oblation of the products of the soil, and no first fruits of incense. The children of Israel assembled together not only for common prayer, but also to read their sacred books - the Law and Prophets."[7]

According to the Mishna, the chief elements of the worship service were:[8]

1) The recitation of the Shema,
2) Prayer,
3) The reading of the Torah,
4) The reading of the Prophets, -followed by Translators
5) and the Blessing of the priest.

---

[1] Philip Schaff, History of the Christian Church, vol. 2, (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1883), p. 456.

[2] I. Abrahams, Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels, vol. 1 (Cambridge, 1917), p. 2.

[3] Guignebert, op. cit., p. 74.

[4] Schurer, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 62.

[5] Guignebert, op. cit., p. 75; reminds us the synagogue had no real minister; What is called a 'minister' by Schurer, is just a title, but does not have the same meaning as a minister of a congregation.

[6] W. H. Frere, The Anaphora, (The MacMillan Co., New York, 1938), p. 12.

[7] Mgr. L. Duchesne, Christian Worship, (The MacMillan Co., London, 1931), p. 47.

[8] Joseph Rabbinowitz, Mishna Megillah, (iv., 3f), (Oxford Un. Press, London, 1931), p. 115f ; lists many things that cannot be done unless there are at least ten men present.

Different orders of worship have been proposed, but it is impossible to know the correct one.[1]

Some say that the services also included singing of Psalms,[2] and even congregational prayers.[3] Since the Mishna was not listing an order of worship, this may have been possible.

The Shema was the name given to the following three biblical passages: Deuteronomy 6:4-9; 11:13-21; Numbers 15:37-41. This formed a central part in the daily service.

The Shema was "distinguished from prayer proper, and is rather a 'confession of faith' than a prayer."[4] There cannot be much room for doubt that the prayers consisted of a number of petitions and acts of praise,

---

[1] T. G. Jalland, The Origin and Evolution of the Christian Church, (Hutchinson's Un. Library, London, 1948), p. 137; says it included Lessons from the Torah (preceded by prayers and benediction), Lessons from the Prophets, Sermon, Confession of Sin and Intercession, and Psalmody; and Oesterley, op. cit., (JBCL), p. 37; says "On Sabbaths and feast-days, there was read in addition to the Pentateuch lesson, a passage from the prophetical books. These were of course always read in Hebrew; but there followed immediately a translation in the vernacular and an explanatory exposition."

[2] Dom Gregory Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy, (Dacre Press, Westminster, 1945), p. 37, "The Jewish synagogue service, which was the root from which the apostolic synaxis sprang, consisted of public readings from the scripture, the singing of psalms, a sermon and number of set prayers;" and Schaff, op. cit., p. 458; says that the service "was simple, but rather long, and embraced three elements, devotional, didactic, and ritualistic. It included prayer, song, reading and exposition of scripture, the rite of circumcision, and ceremonial washings;" and D. H. Hislop, Our Heritage in Public Worship, (T and T Clark, Edinburgh, 1935), p. 61; says "the synagogue was a place of instruction wherein the law was heard, and its worship gathered round the oracle or word of God." In synagogue worship we have congregational participation "which consisted of readings from the Scripture, a homily, prayer, and the use of the psalter."

[3] Guignebert, op. cit., p. 75.

[4] Schurer, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 77.

probably those which finally became the "Shemoneh-esre."[1] The custom was to pray standing,[2] facing the holy of holies (or Jerusalem).[3]

The Mishna tells us that the scripture lessons could be read by anyone in the congregation, including minors.[4] If a priest and a Levite were present, they took precedence in reading the lesson.[5] The lesson from the Torah was read through in a cycle of three years and when reading, a minimum of three verses had to be read. Translation was one verse at a time because of the legal and religious importance of the contents of the Law. But in the case of the prophetical lesson, one could translate three verses at a time. The readings of the prophets were more difficult to understand and needed elaborate interpretation. Also a single verse in the Prophets did not always comprehend a complete thought.[6]

The reading of scripture was always followed by a translation. Whatever portion of scripture was read, an edifying lecture or sermon followed. The translator was seated, and his job was not one of office. He could be any competent member of the congregation according to Philo.[7]

As in the Temple, the priests said the 'blessing.' Every adult priest had the privilege of blessing the people, unless he possessed bodily defects.[8]

---

[1] R. M. Wooley, The Liturgy of the Primitive Church, (Cambridge at Un. Press, 1910), p. 29f; and C. W. Dugmore, The Influence of the Synagogue Upon the Divine Office, (Oxford Un. Press, 1944), p. 22; states "The name Shemoneh Esreh, by which they are commonly known among Christian scholars means 'eighteen,' and its wide use in the Rabbinic literature shows that at the time it came into vogue the number of Benediction included in the prayer must have been eighteen."

[2] Matthew 6:5; Mark 11:25; Luke 18:11.

[3] Ezekiel 8:16; 1 Kings 8:48; Daniel 6:11.

[4] Rabbinowitz, op. cit., (Mishna, Megillah, iv., 6), p. 125.

[5] Schurer, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 79.

[6] Rabbinowitz, op. cit., (Mishna, Megillah, iv., 4), p. 121f.

[7] Schurer, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 82; refers to Philo; and Oesterley, op. cit., (JBCL), p. 37.

[8] Rabbinowitz, op. cit., p. 118.

If no priest was present, the 'blessing' was not pronounced but made into a prayer.[1]

The Jewish synagogue service had a thoroughly democratic constitution. In it, no one held a specially privileged position. Birth, nor station conferred any privileges or prerogatives, with the exception of the blessing of the priests.

Now that we have looked briefly at the Temple and synagogal worship, let us move to the worship found in the book of Acts. In this book we find the early life of the Christian Church.

The apostles followed Jesus' example in the book of Acts, worshipping in the Temple and the synagogue. When Christianity spread from Jerusalem to other cities (such as the cities of the Dispersion), it was the synagogue that was used for discussion, lecturing, debate and even argument.[2]

Discussion was a normal part of the service, and in the discussion the preacher was confronted with the religious people of his day. This gave the apostles an audience with which to share their faith in dialogue.

There are many passages that have a direct relation to the Temple and its worship. Peter and other apostles, as well as Paul used the Temple quite often.[3]

---

[1] Schurer, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 83.

[2] One notes from the book of Acts that Paul "argued," "lectured," or "reasoned." The word used in verses 17:17, 18:4, is διελέγετο , and in 17:2 and 18:19 is διελέξατο.

[3] The following passages are taken from the RSV; Acts 2:46; "And day by day, attending the temple together and breaking bread in their homes, they partook of food with glad and generous hearts;" Acts 3:1; "Now Peter and John were going up to the temple at the hour of prayer, the ninth hour; Acts 5:12; "Now many signs and wonders were done among the people by the hands of the apostles. And they were all together in Solomon's Portico;" Acts 5:21; "And when they had heard this, they entered the temple at daybreak and taught. Now the high priest came and those who were with him and called together the council and the senate of Israel, and sent to the prison to have them brought;" Acts 5:25; "And some one came and told them, 'The men whom you put in prison are standing in the temple and teaching the people;'" Acts 5:42; "And every day in the temple and at home they did not cease teaching and preaching Jesus as the Christ;" Acts 21:26; "Then Paul took the men, and next day he purified himself with them and

In the narrative of Acts the Christians were to be found worshipping in the Temple, and in the synagogues; especially the synagogues of the Dispersion.[1] But the Christians did introduce one new thing - worship and meeting in private houses. The use of houses for worship occurred in Acts 1:12-14 (the disciples in an upper room, together with women, and Mary, the mother of Jesus, and with his brothers); Acts 2:1f (the day of Pentecost, in a house in Jerusalem); Acts 12:12 (the house of Mary, where many were gathered together and were praying); and also in Acts 18:6, while in Corinth, Paul was opposed by the Jews and vowed to preach to the Gentiles. He left the synagogue and went to the house of Titius Justus to continue his witness. In Acts 20:20, we also hear of Paul going from "house to house" teaching.

There is little description of Christian worship in Acts. Acts shows not so much how they worshipped, but the fact that they did worship. Often they worshipped with the Jews in the synagogues. The Christian used this opportunity of speaking in the synagogue to share and discuss his faith. Because of the form or structure of the Jewish synagogue service, the Christian could have a chance to speak.

Essential elements of the early Christian service are mentioned in Acts 2:42 (teaching, fellowship, breaking of bread, prayers), 2:46 (breaking bread), and 20:7 (break bread). Preaching and exhorting (9:20, 13:5, 5:42, 17:10, 14:1) can be found in Acts, as well as teaching (5:42, 5:25, 4:2), prayers (22:17, 3:1), and the breaking of bread (20:7). In Acts 18:6, some are baptized in Corinth, but no passage in Acts tells us the fact that this happened each time

---

went into the temple, to give notice when the days of purification would be fulfilled and the offering presented for every one of them;" Acts 22:17; "When I returned to Jerusalem and was praying in the temple, I fell into a trance...;" Acts 4:2; "... annoyed because they were teaching the people and proclaiming in Jesus the resurrection from the dead;" Acts 24:6; "He even tried to profane the temple, but we seized him."

---

[1] Acts 9:20 (Damascus); Acts 13:5 (Salamis); Acts 13:14-16 (Antioch of Pisidia); Acts 14:1 (Iconium); Acts 17:10 (Beroea); Acts 17:2 (Thessalonica); Acts 17:17 (Athens); Acts 18:4 (Corinth); Acts 18:19 (Ephesus); Acts 19:18 (Ephesus); Acts 18:26 (Apollos in Ephesus); Acts 13:5 (Salamis).

they came together. As Cullmann emphasizes, these are the foundational elements of all the worship life of the Christian community.[1]

Another window into the liturgy of the early church is found in the early Church Fathers.

Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians, contains in chapter 41 a reference to prayers.[2] It is either an allusion to the thought behind Christian thanksgiving, or it is referring to the Eucharist.[3] Chapter 44, gives one a feeling concerning the disorders in Corinth. The allusion seems to be, "to the presentation by the presbyters (or bishops) of the alms and the elements for the Eucharist over which prayers and thanksgivings were offered in the name of the whole body."[4] Other passages in Clement's writing which referred to liturgical practice are chapters 59-61. This lengthy prayer was for help, mercy, peace, and on behalf of those who have "excellent and inexpressible might."[5] An origin of this prayer may have roots in Roman liturgy and was in the prayers of the synagogues of the diaspora.[6] The prayer depended greatly upon the Old Testament, it was simple and direct, and it voiced the period of time; the anxieties, hopes and aspirations of the people.

Clement gave little help for liturgical usage except the fact that prayers were being used. It was interesting to note that scripture highly influenced these prayers.[7]

---

[1] Oscar Cullmann, Early Christian Worship, (trans. by A. S. Todd, and J. B. Torrance), (SCM Press, London, 1953), p. 12.

[2] "Not in every place, my brethren, are the daily sacrifices offered or the free-will offerings ..." (chapter 41)

[3] J. H. Srawley, The Early History of the Liturgy, (Cambridge at the Un. Press, 1947), p. 26.

[4] Ibid., p. 26; "We shall be guilty of no small sin, if we reject men who have holily and without offence offered the gifts pertaining to the office of the bishop."

[5] Lake, op. cit., (AF), vol. 1, p. 115.

[6] Goguel, op. cit., (PC), p. 278; feels Clement thought this prayer would be read at a worship service, "at which it would take the place of instruction."

[7] Hislop, op. cit., p. 82; "In this prayer we see the influence of scripture which is the legacy the Christian Church inherited from Judaism."

The epistles of Ignatius also contain few references to the liturgy of the early church. In the Epistle to the Ephesians, chapter five, he referred to prayer and a common assembly. In chapter thirteen, Ignatius urged the peo- to "come together more frequently, to give thanks and glory to God."[1] This could be an allusion to the Eucharist.

In the Epistle to the Magnesians, chapter seven, there is a prayer of unity.[2] Of course Ignatius' emphasis was unity with the bishop and presbyters, but he paralleled it with the Lord and His Father.

If four passages "he speaks of the Christian assembly as a 'sanctuary' (or 'place of sacrifice!), and in two of these passages there is a reference to the Eucharist in connection with it."[3] Elsewhere, there seems to be an emphasis upon the "conception of the Eucharist as a communion feast upon the flesh and blood of Christ."[4]

Also in the Epistle to the Magnesians, chapter nine, one finds a refer- ence to a special day of worship.[5] This was rather anti-Jewish but emphasized that the Lord's day had become a permanent thing, and had achieved a position, equal to that of the Jewish Sabbath.

---

[1] Lake, op. cit., (AF), p. 187.

[2] Lake, op. cit., (AF), p. 203; (the author urges them to be of "one prayer, one supplication, one mind, one hope in love, in the joy which is without fault, that is Jesus Christ, then whom there is nothing better. Hasten all to come together as to one temple of God...")

[3] Srawley, op. cit., p. 28.

[4] Srawley, op. cit., p. 28.

[5] Lake, op. cit., (AF), p. 205; "If then they who walked in ancient customs came to a new hope, no longer living for the Sabbath, but for the Lord's Day, on which also our life sprang up through him and his death, - though some deny him, - and by this mystery we received faith, and for this reason also we suffer, that we may be found disciples of Jesus Christ our only teacher; if these things be so, how then shall we be able to live without him of who even the prophets were disciples in the Spirit and to whom they looked forward as their teacher?"

Therefore, in Ignatius' writings, one sees symbolism of Christian unity appearing as well as prayer, and possibly an indirect reference to the Eucharist. Micklem states that "Ignatius was later remembered in connection with the antiphonal singing in worship, probably of psalms from the Old Testament Psalter, and possibly also of fresh Christian ones in praise of Christ and thanksgiving to God for His Salvation."[1]

In the Epistle to Barnabas one finds a specific day (chapter fifteen), for worship mentioned also.[2] Srawley states this fixed day was Sunday (as in Acts 22:7, Didache 14, and Ignatius, Magnesians 9).[3] But the epistle does not say this. It talks about a special day, but it was the Sabbath, not the Lord's Day.

In chapter three, fasting is explained in detail.[4] In chapter seven, fasting is also mentioned, as well as a reminder to the people, "to give thanks and praise for everything."[5] Baptism is mentioned, but it was remembered as a past thing that Jesus did.[6]

The Didache shows references to baptism, fasting, prayers, the Eucharist, and even how many times a person must pray. Chapter seven concerns itself with baptism: "Concerning baptism, baptise thus: Having first rehearsed all these things, 'baptise, in the Name of the Father and the Son and of the Holy Spirit,' in running water." The Didache continues by giving instruction about the water (cold, or warm), the fasting of the baptiser, and the one to be baptised, as well as how long the baptised should fast.[7]

---

[1] Micklem, op. cit., p. 88.
[2] Lake, op. cit., (AF), p. 393; "Furthermore it was written concerning the Sabbath in the ten words which he spake on Mount Sinai face to face to Moses. 'Sanctify also the Sabbath of the Lord with pure hands and a pure heart."
[3] Srawley, op. cit., p. 29.
[4] Lake, op. cit., (AF), p. 347.
[5] Lake, op. cit., (AF), p. 365.
[6] Lake, op. cit., (AF), p. 379.
[7] Lake, op. cit., (AF), p. 321.

Chapter eight, continues with fasting and leads into prayers (the Lord's Prayer). This chapter concludes by stating how many times one should pray a day.[1] Chapter nine speaks of the Eucharist - first, concerning the cup, and secondly, the bread. But one was not to eat or drink of the Eucharist unless he was baptised in the Lord's name.[2] Chapter ten gives the final prayer in the Eucharist, closing with the Maranatha (which is a transliteration of the Aramaic meaning, 'Our Lord! Come!').[3] Cullmann states that the oldest celebrations of the Lord's Supper took place in the setting of an actual meal.[4]

Chapter fourteen tells us that it was "the Lord's Day" that they were to come together, break bread and hold the Eucharist, after confessing their transgressions that their offering may be pure. One could not meet for the Eucharist if he had had a quarrel with his fellowman, unless he was reconciled. Otherwise the sacrifice was defiled.[5]

The Didache gives us our fullest outline to this point of the liturgy during this period of time. There was spontaneous worship, as well as a rigid form of worship, which tended to become set in its structure and phrases.

Polycarp told us little about liturgy in his Epistle to the Philippians. Basically he spoke in liturgical language, only of praying and fasting. Chapters four, six and twelve assumed prayers were offered. Polycarp sought prayer

---

[1] Lake, op. cit., (AF), p. 321; "Pray thus three times a day."

[2] Lake, op. cit., (AF), p. 323; "And concerning the Eucharist, hold the Eucharist thus: First concerning cup, 'We give thanks to thee, our Father, for the Holy Vine of David thy child; to thee be glory for ever.' And concerning the broken Bread: 'We give thee thanks, our Father, for the life and knowledge which thou didst make known to us through Jesus thy child. To thee be glory for ever. As this broken bread was scattered upon the mountains, but was brought together and became one, so let thy church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into thy kingdom, for thine is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ forever.' But let none eat or drink of your Eucharist except those who have been baptised in the Lord's Name. For concerning this also did the Lord say, 'Give not that which is holy to the dogs.'"

[3] Lake, op. cit., (AF), pp. 324f.

[4] Cullmann, op. cit., (ECW), p. 14.

[5] Lake, op. cit., (AF), p. 331.

for all men from the widows.[1] In chapter six, there was an appeal that if we ask or pray for forgiveness, then "we also ought to forgive."[2] "Pray also for the saints. Pray also for the Emperors and for the potentates, and princes, and ..." said Polycarp; emphasizing a need to pray for the high officials.[3] The only other possible liturgical reference was one on fasting.[4] This may just be a liturgical rite of discipline, and the prayers may be urged in a private context, not in a community or worship context.

Now let us turn to Justin Martyr. In his Apology one sees a broad outline of worship at this period of history. Within three chapters of this Apology (65-67), Justin described two types of services. The first was the description of a celebration of the Eucharist after baptism. It followed the following pattern (chapters 65-67):

1) Prayers.
2) Kiss of Peace.
3) Praise and Thanksgiving over Bread and Wine by the President.
4) People respond with 'Amen.'
5) Deacons administer the sacraments.

Next, Justin described the Sunday service (chapter 67):

1) Memoirs of Apostles or the Writings of the Prophets (as time permits).
2) President instructs the people to practice the truths in the lessons.
3) All stand and offer prayers together.
4) After prayers, bread and wine is brought forth and blessed by the President.
5) People respond with 'Amen.'
6) Elements distributed to all present (to the absent also) by the Deacons.

Justin stated in conclusion that the Christian day of worship was the first day of the week, because it commemorates the Creation and Lord's resurrection.

---

[1] Lake, op. cit., (AF), p. 289; "Let us teach the widows to be discreet in the faith of the Lord, praying ceaselessly for all men..."
[2] Lake, op. cit., (AF), p. 291.
[3] Lake, op. cit., (AF), p. 299.
[4] Lake, op. cit., (AF), p. 293.

It is still obvious that there were parts of the synagogal worship within the church. But there were elements added also. The lessons were not fixed now, and apparently there may be only one. Also Justin implied that the length of the lessons and probably the choice of them was left to the anagnostes.[1]

We have spanned a period of history from pre-Christian into the second century, briefly looking at historical data on the worship of this period. Now let us look at the influences upon the early Christian church made by the Jewish faith.

Most scholars feel the early Christian church worship was basically influenced by the synagogue. The early Christian church has been called a "model,"[2] a "continuation,"[3] a "spring from a common fount,"[4] and one of "direct inheritance."[5] "Christian worship was continuous with Jewish worship,"[6] and was "based on the usage of the synagogue,"[7] and according to Kirk "had no desire of being other than Jewish."[8] Without stating directly that this was true, Oesterley,[9] and Foakes-Jackson,[10] feels the early church resembled the Jewish synagogue greatly.

Jewish worship contained at least ten elements.[11] Two of the elements have not been emphasized. One was the Kaddish, which means 'sanctification'

---

[1] Wooley, op. cit., p. 31.
[2] Lyman Coleman, The Apostolical and Primitive Church, (Gould, Kendal and Lincoln, Boston), 1844, p. 39.
[3] Dix, op. cit., p. 36.
[4] Dugmore, op. cit., p. 1.
[5] W. D. Maxwell, An Outline of Christian Worship, (Oxford Un. Press, London, 1936), p. 2.
[6] Moule, op. cit., p. 10.
[7] Adolf Schlatter, The Church in the New Testament, (trans. by Paul Levertoff), (SPCK, London, 1955), p. 63.
[8] Kirk, op. cit., pp. 410-11.
[9] Oesterley, op. cit., (JBCL), p. 154.
[10] F. J. Foakes- Jackson, Studies in the Life of the Early Church, (George H. Doran, New York, 1924), pp. 166f.
[11] Oesterley, op. cit., (JBCL), pp. 36-82; He lists ten elements: 1) Reading of Scripture; 2) Exposition; 3) the Shema; 4) Prayer; 5) Amen; 6) Kaddish; 7) Psalms; 8) Confession; 9) Kiddush; 10) Decalogue.

and referred to the Name of God.[1] It basically fell into the worship as a part of the responses, and may have taken the same form in the Christian service. Secondly, the Kiddush, which was a weekly ceremony to usher in the Sabbath, was not part of synagogue worship.

The early service or services,[2] had distinctive elements, as did the synagogue. As we saw in Acts the Christian communities continued in the traditional mode of worship to which each had been accustomed. As Jews this form satisfied them, for they continued in this custom. But when Christ came a basic change in their lives occurred, which in turn, flowed into all of their daily actions, which included worship. It was natural for them to continue in the form and thought of their traditional liturgy, as well as to add to it from their own faith.

We have already seen from Acts that the early Christians (during the apostles and Paul's time), worshipped in at least three places: the Temple, the synagogue, and private houses. The Jewish influence was still quite strong. "There was nothing in the central elements of the worship of the synagogue," in which the Christian could not join.[3]

Let us now compare the early Christian elements in worship with the synagogal liturgy. The form will be to take each element and expound on it as far as we can using the Church Fathers, up to Justin, and the New Testament,

---

[1] Oesterley, op. cit., (JBCL), p. 72; "The origin of this liturgical piece is to be sought in the words, 'May His great Name be blessed for ever and to all eternity.' In the liturgy there are three forms of Kaddish, and it marks off the close of parts of the service."

[2] Dix, op. cit., p. 36; "The primitive core of the liturgy fall into two parts - the Synaxis (a Greek word which means properly simply a 'meeting'), and the Eucharist proper (or 'thanksgiving'). These were separate meetings, which had a different origin."

[3] Oesterley, op. cit., (JBCL), p. 99.

omitting the Pastorals, as our resources. This form being used is not in any way connected with a possible outline of such a service.

The reading of scripture for the Jew and the Christian was the Old Testament. This was a "vivid testimony to the union between the old Israel and the new."[1] It was not only a testimony but an educational link, because knowledge of these writings was gained by hearing scripture read during the public services. The Jewish practice was to read first from the Law of Moses as the most revered of their scriptures, then one or more lessons from the Prophets or other books.[2]

During his journeys Paul spoke in many synagogues. We know from his recorded sermons that his method was to prove through scripture that Jesus was the Messiah, and that in scripture his life and death and resurrection were pretold. It is clear that by the time of Justin Martyr (Dialogue 28 and 85; Apology 65 and 67), the sermon had become an integral part of Christian worship.

Prayer was an important element in synagogue worship and became equally important in Christian worship. Worship without prayer was not possible. Prayer included praise, thanksgiving, confession and the use of the Lord's Prayer. The prayers in the book of Acts included both Temple (Acts 3:1), and domestic prayers during Christian gatherings (Acts 1:24, 4:24f, 12:12). The devout Jew prayed three times a day and it was clear from Acts that the first Christians continued this practice. By the time of the Didache the devout Christian used the Lord's Prayer three times each day. Other examples of the church at prayer in the New Testament are to be found in Acts 6:6, 12:5, and 1 Corinthians 14:14-16, as well as in Ignatius.[3] Prayer as

---

[1]Schlatter, op. cit., p. 64.
[2]Dix, op. cit., p. 39.
[3]Lake, op. cit., (AF), p. 187.

confession is found in 1 Clement 52:1.[1] Examples of prayers of confession are also in the Didache 4:14 and 14:1.

The Psalms or Hymns were also rarely mentioned. The three better known passages are found in Ephesians,[2] Colossians,[3] and 1 Corinthians.[4] Hymns, and "short ejaculations were frequently addressed to Christ. Many of the hymns were adapted from Jewish compositions.[5]

From Judaism Christian worship took over the responsive 'Amen.'[6] It was said by the people or congregation. But there is a reference to its use as done by one individual.[7] 1 Corinthians 14:16 shows how the responsive 'Amen' was used.[8] It was a Semitic word connected with a root meaning firmness, consistency and truthfulness.[9]

Originally the Christian simply observed the Jewish Sabbath. But by the end of the first century the Lord's Day was the Christians sacred day. It commemorated, not the rest of God after the Creation, as the Jewish Sabbath did, but the event of the resurrection.[10] No doubt for some time the Sabbath and the Lord's Day existed side by side but by the time of Ignatius (Mag. 9:1), the Christian church described itself as observing the Lord's Day and not the Sabbath.

---

[1] Lake, op. cit., (AF), p. 99; "The Master, brethren, is need of nothing; he asks nothing of anyone, save that confession be made to him."

[2] Eph. 5:19; "... addressing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody to the Lord with all your heart."

[3] Col. 3:16; "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly, as you teach and admonish one another in all wisdom, and as you sing psalms and hymns and spiritual songs with thankfulness in your hearts to God."

[4] 1 Cor. 14:26; "What then, brethren? When you come together, each one has a hymn, a lesson, a revelation, a tongue, or an interpretation. Let all things be done for edification."

[5] Craig, op. cit., p. 279.

[6] Cullmann, op. cit., (ECW), p. 108.

[7] A. B. MacDonald, Christian Worship in the Primitive Church, (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1934), p. 108; (found in Polycarps prayer).

[8] 1 Cor. 14:16; "Otherwise, if you bless with the spirit, how can anyone in the position of an outsider say the 'Amen' to your thanksgiving when he does not know what you are saying?"

[9] Moule, op. cit., p. 73f; It appears "frequently enough as a formula of confirmation. In the main, the liturgical use of 'Amen' is as the congregations appropriation and confirmation of what has been uttered on their

There are two liturgical elements that have purposely been left out. One is the Eucharist, and the other is baptism. These may have been entirely separate services, and may have had specific historical background to be based on.[1]

The significance of the Eucharist was important to each Christian. The Eucharist was a unifying common memory of the Christ, and held a special place in the early church.[2] The disciples especially had deep significant memories of this meal.[3] From the earliest days the churches had their common meal called the Love Feast, or the Agape. And it was in the context of the Agape that the Eucharist was observed.[4]

The earliest account of the Lord's Supper was Paul's to the church at Corinth (1 Cor. 11:23f). Paul was handing down a tradition "received from the Lord." It would be difficult and possibly very misleading to try to tell

---

behalf by the leader of worship."

[10] K. S. Latourette, History of Christianity, (Harper and Brothers, New York, 1953), p. 199; and Cullmann, op. cit., (ECW), p. 11.

---

[1] It is not this author's intention to debate whether this meal was the passover meal or not. My intention is to make mention the importance of the Eucharist to the early church. We are concerned with this service, and what elements it had in it.

[2] John Knox, The Early Church, (Abingdon Press, New York, 1955), pp. 85-6; "The sacrament of the Lord's Supper, besides reflecting the universal, all but instinctive, recognition of eating together as a symbol and means and fellowship, rests on the disciples memories of meals with Jesus, pre-eminently the final meal."

[3] Cullmann, op. cit., (ECW), p. 14f.

[4] Dix, op. cit., p. 78; feels that they (eucharist and agape) grew out of the same meal (Chaburah), and are two different meals. "It is evident that though they are clearly distinguished, both are ultimately derived from the chaburah supper; and it is, I think, also clear how their separation has been effected. The eucharist consists simply of those things in the chaburah supper to which our Lord had attached a special new meaning with reference to Himself, extracted from the rest of the Lord's supper, to which no special Christian meaning was attached. The agape is simply what remains of the chaburah meal when the eucharist has been extracted;" but Craig, op. cit., p. 280; disagrees.

exactly what happened at each service,[1] due to the fact that there is little evidence at all as to structure or content prior to the Didache, and even here we find little. Other early church fathers shows only fragments, and the New Testament is almost completely silent as to the structure of the content of the Lord's Supper.

Besides the references to such a meal instituted by the Christ in the gospels, Paul referred to blessings over the bread and cup (1 Cor. 10:16), as a tradition handed down (1 Cor. 11:23f) to him. In Acts 2:42 we know the breaking of bread happened on the first day of the week (Acts 20:7-11).

Among the early church writings references are found to the Eucharist. Among them are the Didache (9, 10, 14), Clement of Rome (41), the Epistles of Ignatius, and a passage in Pliny's letter to Trajan.[2] But there is no kind of detailed description until we arrive at the Didache and Justin Martyr.

Combining all of these references with Justin Martyr's First Apology, one formulates a scheme that looks something like this:

1) Lections (consisting of memoirs of the apostles or writings of the prophets).
2) Sermon by the President.
3) Common prayers for all men (standing).
4) The kiss of peace.
5) Presentation to the President of the bread and a cup of wine and water.
6) Praise, prayer, and thanksgiving offered (by the President).
7) Then the deacons administer to those present the bread and the cup, over which thanks have been given.[3]

---

[1] Dix, op. cit., p. 78f; states it began with the offertory, then the prayer (a thanksgiving); following the prayer came the fraction (the given body); lastly, came the communion; Srawley, op. cit., p. 11; feels the meal included a blessing over a cup, a breaking of bread, the fellowship (koinonia) or communion (feast), and the unity of the worshippers found expression in the symbolism of the one loaf; and Cullmann, op. cit., (ECW), p. 20; as mentioned earlier; each service consisted of a sermon, prayers and a meal; and E. Schweizer, "Worship in the New Testament," The Reformed and Presbyterian World, xxiv, 5, March, 1957, pp. 203-4; says that there are things that definitely took place -- the first was the proclamation of the death of Jesus, "through the feast which he Himself instituted." The Lord's Supper, "proclaims this death as a saving event with meaning for

Another special service was Christian baptism. Baptism either paralleled Judaism (similar to their proselyte baptism),[1] or it grew out of the pattern of the gospel story.[2] It was possibly equal to circumcision (not proselyte baptism) in the Jewish tradition,[3] or maybe it symbolized a means of initiation separate from anything else.

There are many passages in the New Testament that refer to baptism.[4] They either mention that some one had been baptized or that those who were baptized were baptized "into Christ." Baptism was an outward entry to the early church. It was the initiation into the church. The requirements for baptism were repentance and faith.[5]

---

each individual." Secondly, "in the consummation of the Lord's Supper, the congregation is taken up into the Body of Christ." Thirdly, "it is strongly held that the Lord's Supper is a foretaste of future table-fellowship with the ascended Christ."

[2]Srawley, op. cit., pp. 28f.

[3]Srawley, op. cit., p. 31.

---

[1]Oesterley, op. cit., (JBCL), p. 142; "... the rite of Baptism (Tebilah) was necessary for proselytes to Judaism in pre-Christian times;" and Knox, op. cit., p. 85; "The adoption of baptism as the symbol and means of initiation into the church must undoubtedly be understood in some connection with proselyte baptism in Judaism."

[2]Moule, op. cit., pp. 47f; "The whole context of thought attaching to baptism in the New Testament is clearly enough a reflection of Christ's own ministry. His own baptism, His special endowment by the spirit, His life of service, His death, His resurrection, - that which is the pattern of the gospel-story is the pattern also of Christian baptism."

[3]F. C. Grant, The Early Days of Christianity, (Abingdon Press, New York, 1922), p. 278; Baptism was an essential feature of the Christian religion from its very beginning." This was the normal way to become a Christian, and this same procedure was followed by Paul in the Gentile mission. "It is sometimes said that baptism was taken over from the custom of the Jews in the Diaspora who baptized their Gentile proselytes." According to Grant this was not the same as Christian baptism, "which admitted one to full-fledgedmembership in the church." This was "a rite to which circumcision was the real Jewish parallel."

[4]Acts 2:38; 2:41; 8:13; 8:16; 8:36f; 9:18; 10:47; 19:3; Rom. 6:3; Gal. 3:27; Eph. 4:5; Col. 2:12; and 1 Peter 3:21.

[5]Grant, op. cit., (EDC), p. 278.

Thus far it is difficult to pin-point many definite elements dealing with the liturgy. We know from the New Testament and the early church writers a form or structure was beginning to take form.

The character of worship in the Pastorals represents a significant beginning of structured worship, and helped to bridge the gap. The elements of worship in the Pastorals show clearly where the early church placed the emphasis. In 1 Timothy 4:13 we find the three main elements of the Christian service:

> "Till I come, attend to the public reading of scripture, to preaching, to teaching."

The first element was that of scripture reading. This denoted primarily the public reading of the Old Testament. This feature was also a feature of the synagogue service and is mentioned in Luke 4:16, Acts 15:21, and 2 Corinthians 3:14. This public reading also included Apostolic letters, apocalypses,[1] memoirs of the Apostles, or the writings of the prophets, (Justin Martyr, Apology 11:67). The public readings formed a true and genuine basis for exhortation and teaching.

Even though public reading was the emphasis, one needs to mention 2 Timothy 3:15, where Timothy was being told to stand by what he had learned in his earlier days.[2]

> ". . .and how from childhood you have been acquainted with the sacred writings which are able to instruct you for salvation through faith in Christ Jesus."

This included private reading of scripture within his home. The sacred

---

[1] Lock, op. cit., p. 53; Apostolic letters (1 Thess. 5:27; Eph. 3:4; Col. 4:16; Euseb. H. E. 4:23), apocalypses (Mk. 13:14; Rev. 1:3; cf. Tert. Apol. 39.

[2] Hanson, op. cit., (S), p. 43; says this does not mean Timothy was instructed at an early age in scripture, "for we cannot be sure at all that his mother was a Christian when he was born."

writings referred to are probably the Old Testament, but there are some who feel they are other writings.[1] Without the article, the reference could easily be a technical term for such writings, which were many times called 'sacred.'

Generally it was the synagogue that had copies of scripture, not the homes. Therefore, this verse about Timothy's early training could refer to some type of home service.[2] Even though this verse is not a reference to public worship, it sheds light on the advancement of sacred readings within the church.

The second element is 'exhortation.' This was doubtlessly the exposition of the text. Constantly we see throughout these epistles, the recipients were repeatedly enjoined to preach the Word without intermission (1 Tim. 4:11, 4:13, 4:15f, 6:2, 6:17; 2 Tim. 2:2, 2:14f, 4:1f, 4:5; Tit. 2:1, 2:7, 2:15). Even though some of these passages refer to the work of evangelism and instruction rather than to worship, they still emphasize the importance of exhortation based on scripture.[3]

Acts 13:15f shows exhortation as a definite part of the synagogue worship. Paul was asked, after the reading of the law and prophets, to speak if he would like. Usually this type of exhortation was based on the scripture previously read.

Exhortation and teaching are distinguished from one another in this passage, though the two shade into one another. The exhortation was probably

---

[1] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 201; gives a summary of disagreements but feels that the evidence falls toward this meaning in the Old Testament. "There is abundant evidence that this was a stock designation for it in Greek-speaking Judaism (cf. Philo and Josephus); and Falconer, op. cit., p.92.

[2] H. L. Strack, and P. Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch, 3rd edition, (Munnich, 1961).

[3] Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 29.

a monologue, whereas the teaching could easily involve dialogue. One might encourage the other. The teaching might be based upon the lesson, but it did not have to be.[1] It might signify a "catechetical instruction" in Christian doctrine.[2]

The interesting point about these three elements of worship (scripture reading, etc) is that none of them seem to be explained in any great detail throughout the rest of the epistles. They were all treated rather equally. One was not emphasized more than another. Teaching was as important as the other two. But the key point is that they all went together. It was difficult in a service of worship to have one without the other.

Hymns or creeds were also part of the worship service. Echoes of these are found in at least three different passages in the Pastorals. Each one has individuality, and will therefore be considered as such.

1 Timothy 2:5-6 has been considered as a "piece of a eucharistic anaphora."[3]

> "For there is one God, and there is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus."

This does not seem logical, especially from the standpoint that the Pastorals are not sacramental in any way. It has been suggested that it may even be a primitive creed.[4] If this is true, it may have been introduced here because it emphasized the 'mediator' as a man, which would certainly be against Gnostic notions.[5]

---

[1] Parry, op. cit., p. 28; disagrees and says Romans 12:7 is proof.
[2] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 105.
[3] Carrington, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 267.
[4] Easton, op. cit., p. 122; "Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is One Lord."
[5] A. J. B. Higgins, Peakes Commentary on the Bible, Matthew Black, H. H. Rowley, editors, (Thomas Nelson and Sons, London, 1962), p. 1002; "Note the striking juxtaposition of 'men' and 'the man' (anarthrous in the Greek)."

There are two major views on this issue. First, it has been suggested that some of the phrases or words of this passage originally came from Job. On top of this there was a parallel in tradition here between Clement and the Pastorals.[1] Therefore, this passage could easily be a creed, or set of religious sayings, handed down through oral tradition which the early church devised and rearranged for itself.

The second suggestion is that 1 Timothy 2:5-6 was not a creed or a church confession, but the writer's own comment on familiar words of scripture.[2] This could be true, but there were indications that it might deal with previous Jewish or earlier Christian creeds. Even if it was just a memory of past scripture, it may be a confession now.

1 Timothy 2:5-6 was certainly within the liturgical context of the rest of the passages surrounding it. Whether it was a creed, confession or an inheritance from the Jewish faith, it reflected the problem facing the church. The passages were probably a formula in hymnological or creedal form against the paganistic forces outside the church.[3]

Taking these verses in their context, assuming that 1 Timothy 2:1-6 was a prayer gives us reason to believe that verses 5 and 6 were a formula that expressed the history of the past. Verse 5 is considered to be the more recent and suggests a "Hellenistic Jewish-Christian provenance." Verse 6 is older and may go back to the Aramaic-speaking church.[4]

---

[1] Hanson, op. cit., (S), pp. 62-3.
[2] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 21.
[3] Other suggestions are: Oscar Cullmann, The Earliest Christian Confessions, (trans. by J. K. S. Reid), (Lutterworth Press, London), 1949, p. 42f; suggests that the use of the word 'forgiveness' in verse 6 indicates a baptismal context; and Hanson, op. cit., (S), p. 62; says that "possibly the use of the phrase 'knowledge of the truth,' (in verse 4), seems to point in this direction also. It seems to be used in reference to baptism in Hebrews 10:26.
[4] Hanson, op. cit., (S), p. 63; does not mean to suggest that this passage in some form goes back to Jesus himself (p. 128); but basically is saying that "the author probably did not compose the formula in verse 6 himself, and it is most unlikely that he composed that in verse 5 either."

The thought of the Church as the support of the truth in 1 Timothy 3:16 led the author to an explanation of the greatness of the mystery in that truth.

> "Great indeed, we confess, is the mystery of our religion: He was manifested in the flesh, vindicated in the Spirit, seen by angels, preached among the nations, believed on in the world, taken up in glory."

The mystery of the religion meant those truths which could only be known to man by direct revelation. These were truths which could not be reached by any process of reasoning from natural observation.[1]

There have been many different explanations as to what this verse (1 Tim. 3:16) really means. One has called it a eucharistic hymn,[2] while another referred to it as a Christological hymn.[3] Others have referred to its content as a creed,[4] or a creedal hymn,[5] or confession of faith,[6] while most call it a hymn.[7] From this array of definitions it is obvious that all feel it to have liturgical significance (and most call it a hymn). The present writer has to agree, because the passage was "borne out by the careful parallelism of the strophes, the rhythmic diction, and the deliberate assonance (very marked in the Greek), of the six third person singular

---

[1] Hanson, op. cit., (S), p. 21; says the clue to the mystery is to be found in the Fourth Book of Maccabees. "This is a rhetorical piece on the subject of the martyrdom of the 7 sons in the Antiochen persecution composed apparently about the beginning of the Christian era."

[2] Brown, op. cit., p. 32.

[3] Kirk, op. cit., p. 413.

[4] MacDonald, op. cit., p. 118; but Hillard, op. cit., p. 36, says it cannot be a creed, because the only evidence in the New Testament of a special creed form is of baptism.

[5] Falconer, op. cit., p. 138.

[6] Schaff, op. cit., p. 138.

[7] Lock, op. cit., pp. 44-5; and Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 64f; either hymn or creed; and Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 89f; and Parry op. cit., p.23; and Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 41f; who calls it a hymn, confession or poem; and Coleman, op. cit., p. 366; and Schweizer, op. cit., (RPW), p. 199; and Craig, op. cit., p. 279.

aorist verbs."[1] If the passage is recognised as a quotation, especially from a hymn, we are saved from seeking to find in it a special chronological order. Also we will not be trying to find a meaning in antithesis which may be more in the rhythm of the verse than in the statement.

The structure of the hymn could be arranged in three different ways. First, it could be two three-lined strophes.[2] Secondly, Jeremias recommended dividing it into three groups.[3] The third way is six individual lines. Basically the structure is immaterial, but what is important is the message. Structure could not really alter the message unless one is trying to place a chronological significance on it.

The Christological message of 1 Timothy 3:16 is quite clear. But, it is worth noting that two typically Pauline theological aspects are missing.[4] Nowhere in the hymn is the death and resurrection of Christ mentioned. Also, unlike Clement of Rome, this author set forth no fulfilment of prophecy in the facts of the gospel history.[5]

The substance of this passage is the historic gospel preached as it is found in Luke and Acts. In this hymn the heart of the believer is raised at once to the incarnate, now exalted and triumphant Christ.

---

[1] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 89.

[2] Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 64; says this is possible but not necessary, "since each of the six lines is similar in form, and is legitimate to arrange them, as three couplets or six parallel single lines;" and Lock, op. cit., p. 45; because this would balance the contrasting Incarnate Lord with the Ascended Lord.

[3] Jeremias, op. cit.,; divides it into three groups: First, the King is exalted, secondly, He is presented, and thirdly, He is enthroned.

[4] Kasemann, op. cit., (E), p. 153; even states that the concepts used here are not typically Pauline; and Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 91; "But if he is here citing a current hymn and citing only a part, it is at least possible that the part not cited contained these great truths;" but, Falconer, op. cit., p. 138; says there are echoes of Paul, as found in Col. 1:23-27, and Phil. 2:6-11.

[5] Falconer, op. cit., p. 139.

When taken clause by clause Barrett found this message:

1) the incarnation,
2) the resurrection,
3) the ascension,
4) the preaching of the gospel,
5) the response to it,
6) the final victory of Christ.[1]

Immediately we see that he included the resurrection. This is correct if the word 'in' is taken in an instrumental sense and reading 'spirit' as denoting the Holy Spirit. But this is quite unlikely. Probably 'spirit' is parallel to 'flesh' in the first clause, which would give Christ the divine and human elements respectively.[2] Lock adds to this: He either "was made righteous in the spiritual sphere," (kept sinless through the action of the Spirit upon His Spirit), or "was justified" (in His claims to be the Christ in virtue of the Spirit which dwelt in Him).[3]

Therefore, one sees that the hymn (1 Tim. 3:16) expresses the historical life of Jesus, as well as his continued life as the Lord of the church. The writer of the Pastorals was not as interested in the fact that it is hymn as we are. He was speaking in the context of the church, and quoted this hymn because it threw light on this 'mystery' of the Lordship of Christ, on which the church must build its faith.[4]

2 Timothy 2:11-13 presents us with another liturgical hymn.

> "The saying is sure: If we have died with him, we shall also live with him; if we endure, we shall also reign with him; if we deny him, he also will deny us; if we are faithless, he remains faithful - for he cannot deny himself."

---

[1]Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 66.
[2]Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 90; and Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 89.
[3]Lock, op. cit., pp. 45f.
[4]Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 43.

It has been called a "poetic antithesis" by Coleman,[1] but most call this a hymn also.[2] It seems to be of Jewish Christian provenance, and the first strophe may be reminiscent of Romans 6:8.[3] The third strophe reminds one of the Lord's saying reported in Matthew 10:33.[4] Its liturgical nature follows a direct pattern but near the end it changes.[5]

Two suggestions as to this passage's (2 Tim. 2:11-13) original meaning are: first, that it was written in face of persecution, encouraging boldness, and warning against defection;[6] and second, that it was a baptismal hymn.[7] The only definite thing we know about this hymn is that it was only part of a hymn.[8] This is reasonable because the conjunction 'for' preceded it. Therefore, it is possible to be inclusive here also. In other words it could

---

[1]Colemann, op. cit., p. 366.

[2]Schaff, op. cit., p. 463; and Lock, op. cit., p. 96; and Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 179; says it was probably quite familiar to Timothy and the community.

[3]Rom. 6:8; But if we have died with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him."

[4]Matt. 10:33; "... but whoever denies me before men, I also will deny before my Father who is in heaven;" and Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 179; and Falconer, op. cit., p. 82; who shows a list of many echoes of Paul and the gospels.

[5]Parry, op. cit., p. 56; "The antithetic and partially rhythmical form of these clauses has suggested that they are a quotation from some liturgical formula or hymn: and this may be so: on the other hand the last two couplets do not read quite consistently with this suggestion; and they have a very close bearing on the preceding insistence upon faithful and loyal endurance. It is perhaps best to regard the whole as influenced in form by liturgical practice rather than as a definite quotation. There is however nothing in itself improbable in a liturgical reference: Christian worship must have already developed many forms of expression."

[6]Lock, op. cit., p. 96.

[7]Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 104; it suggests a past event - the Christians conversion to baptism; and Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 179; but Brown, op. cit., p. 67; says the phrase 'if we died with him,' does not refer to baptism, "but to the literal death of those who suffered for Christ, and the life is the life beyond the grave."

[8]Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 105; and Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 179.

have been written in persecuting times for baptism. We must leave this hanging and suggest it is difficult to identify its setting.

The message in this passage is one of God's continued, malterable, consistent promises. The author was trying to impress upon our minds our connection with Christ in Christian fellowship. What He promises, He will keep. What we do is our testimony to our accepting or refusing His offer. Our death to sin (possibly this is a reference to baptism), as Paul expounded in Romans 6:8, is our joining with Christ.[1] If we bear with Him, we shall also reap with Him. This is the Christian hope. Possibly there is a parallel to this in Polycarp 5:2.[2]

Another part of the worship service was prayer. 1 Timothy 2:1-2 says:

> "First, of all, then, I urge that supplications, prayers, intercessions and thanksgivings be made for all men, kings and all who are in high positions, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life, godly and respectful in every way."

Immediately one recognizes the universality of this prayer. This emphasis could easily be because of gnostic tendencies of exclusiveness, based on undue stress on knowledge. The author did not want the church to fail, as the Jews had done, in recognizing the universality of its mission.[3]

The use of the word 'therefore' (οὖν) refers us back to the preceding verses. In other words, as an outcome of 1:18-20, which reminded Timothy that in Paul's absence, and in God's strength, he should carry on, he was to avoid a 'shipwrecked' life and be in constant prayer for all men, including rulers.

---

[1] Jeremias, op. cit.,; the baptismal death.

[2] Lake, op. cit., (AF), p. 289; and Easton, op. cit., p. 53; "Possibly Polycarp quotes 2 Timothy from memory; possibly he cites another couplet from the same hymn."

[3] Lock, op. cit., p. 24; parallels this thought with the epistle to the Romans ; but he also says that verses 5-7 suggest that this emphasis may also be due to Jewish exclusiveness.

There are four types of prayers mentioned. Each of these terms for prayers are closely connected, and practically synonymous. They show us that the chief purpose of prayer was simply to make clear that it was a cardinal act in worship.[1] Even though this was so, the present writer wants to take these terms separately for discussion. They each have merit on their own.

The first were 'petitions' or 'supplications' (deeseis). The significant difference in deeseis and proseuchai ('prayers'), was that 'petitions' brought out a clearer sense of need.[2] A 'petition' emphasized something that arose out of a concrete situation.[3] Deeseis suggested man's request on his own behalf,[4] and perhaps was less widely known than proseuchai. These two types of prayers occurred together quite often in the New Testament and in the Septuagint.[5]

Oddly enough, the most general term for prayers was placed second. These 'prayers' usually consisted of short, concise and precise prayers. They usually gathered up and expressed some need of the church or the world, and put it before God, that He might hear it in the name of His Son. Basically, it was the ordinary word for prayer to God and could be used as deeseis could of 'petitions' to men.[6] Lock says that deeseis emphasizes the need, proseuchai the approach to God, and enteuxeis the actual petition.[7]

Enteuxeis was a very suitable word to describe 'intercessions'. It had a close association with formal petitions to a superior authority.[8] But the

---

[1] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 19; emphasizes that everything in the service is prayer, in varying form.
[2] Parry, op. cit., p. 11; and Lock, op. cit., p. 24.
[3] Falconer, op. cit., p. 127; refers us to Romans 10:1.
[4] Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 49.
[5] R. C. Trench, Synonyms of the New Testament, (Kegan Paul, Trench and Co., London, 1886), p. 188; New Testament; Phil. 4:6; Eph. 6:18; 1 Tim. 2:1; 5:5; and the Septuagint: Ps. 6:10; Dan. 9:21; 9:23; 1 Macc. 7:37.
[6] Trench, op. cit., p. 189; and Hillard, op. cit., p. 18.
[7] Lock, op. cit., p. 24; this is a favorite triad of Pauls and makes clear that this is a primary reference to public worship.
[8] Acts 25:24; Rom. 8:27, 34, 11:2; Heb. 7:25.

word itself is only found in the New Testament, in 1 Timothy (2:1 and 4:5)! It is used as a formal petition, especially to a king, and is found frequently in the later writings of Josephus and Diodorus.[2] Enteuxeis carries with it the sense of pleading.[3] To define the word as meaning 'intercession' does not mean what is commonly thought of as 'intercession' today; namely, prayer in relation to others (1 Tim. 4:5).[4] The word did not have such a limited meaning at one time, as we ascribe to it today.

The fourth type of prayer was the eucharistias. This was the natural accompaniment of prayer. In this passage (1 Tim. 2:1-2) the term did not have the technical meaning of the eucharist.[5] It was regarded as one manner of prayer and expressed that which ought never to be absent from any of our devotions: "namely, the grateful acknowledgment of past mercies, as distinguished from the earnest seeking of the future."[6]

It is not likely that 1 Timothy 2:1-2 was a list of prayers in a special form, even though they could be taken in this way. Their order could indicate a form, but it seems more likely that they are a list of types of prayers within a service. We need to be careful about putting too much emphasis in this direction. It would be a mistake to try to distinguish too clearly between these various forms of prayer.[7]

---

[1] Lock, op. cit., p. 24; says to cf. 2 Macc. 4:8; 3 Macc. 6:40; which emphasizes that the word suggests that one was to hopefully have the good fortune to be admitted to an audience with the king, so as to present a petition.

[2] Adolf Deismann, Biblical Studies, trans. by A. Grieve, (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1901), pp. 121, 146.

[3] Hillard, op. cit., p. 18.

[4] Trench, op. cit., p. 190; "In justice, however, to our translators, it must be observed that 'intercessions' had not in their time that limited meaning of prayer 'for others' which we now ascribe it."

[5] Lock, op. cit., p. 25; and a careful examination of the word can be found in Dr. Swete's article in the Journal of Theological Studies, iii, p. 161; but, Kelly, op. cit., p. 60; says that this a reference to the eucharist.

[6] Trench, op. cit., p. 191; Dellinq. p. 124.

[7] Hanson, op. cit., (C), p. 32.

The theme of universality was carried out in the end of this verse (1 Tim. 2:1-2). Prayers should be made for all men. We should note the stress on the word 'all.' There should be nothing exclusive about prayer. This is an emphatic reminder of verse 4 and 6 of the same chapter that God wants all to know the truth, and that Jesus Christ gave His life for all mankind. The exclusiveness that had Jewish and gnostic origins in the Ephesian community was probably connected with the false teaching and the author made it clear that "narrowness of this kind offends against the gospel of Christ."[1] Prayer for all was the duty of the church.

The second verse adds to this thought of universality by saying that prayer should include rulers and all others in authority. The appeal was not to principles, but to considerations of expediency.[2] This type of intercession was not the creation of the early church, but had its origin in Judaism. It was used in the synagogue of the diaspora. Even at Jerusalem, a sacrifice was offered for the emperor each day. One might call this sacrifice a compromise, as it provided proof of the fact that the Jews could give loyalty yet not be emperor-worshippers.[3]

Also Clement of Rome, in his great liturgical prayer emphasized the prayer for men in high positions.[4] The parallel between Clement and the

---

[1] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 60.

[2] Maurice Goguel, The Birth of Christianity, (trans. by H. C. Snape), (London, 1953), p. 550; says Paul would have appealed to principles.

[3] Schurer, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 181f.

[4] Lake, op. cit., (AF), p. 115; "Thou, Master, has given the power of sovereignty to them through thy excellent and inexpressible might, that we may know the glory and honor given to them by thee, and be subject to them, in nothing resisting thy will. And to them, Lord, grant health, peace, concord, firmness that they may administer the government which thou hast given them without offence."

Pastorals is striking.[1] The emphasis in Clement, was that we should pray for high officials in order that they may administer the government." Whereas in the Pastorals, the prayer was for the rulers in order that the Christians might lead a "quiet and peaceable life."

Polycarp[2] also advised prayer for kings, magistrates and princes, but for a different motive than the Pastorals. The Roman authorities were to be prayed for here because they were enemies of the Christians. Even evidence in Tertullian shows that when feasts were given for emperors, the Christians surpassed that of the pagans with honor, by decorating their houses with garlands and torches.[3]

Therefore, the author of the Pastoral Epistles continued in tradition, probably recognizing the protective value of such prayer. This would be natural to Paul and his beliefs also (Rom. 13).

---

[1]Hanson, op. cit., (S), pp. 63-4; Table 1, p. 64:

1 Timothy 2:1-6	1 Clement LIX-LXI
1. supplications	LIX. 2. supplication
4. knowledge of the truth	knowledge of his glorious name.
1. for all men	4. afflicted, humble, fallen, needy, ungodly, wandering, hungry, prisoners, sick, fainthearted, let all the nations know that thou above art God
4. God desires all men to be saved	
1. for kings and all who are in high positions	LX. 4. our rulers and leaders on
	LXI. 1. the earth
3. this is good and it is acceptable in the sight of God	2. according to what is right and well-pleasing in thy sight administering in godly fashion the authority given to them by thee with peace and mildness
2. that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life, godly and respectful in every way	
5. and there is one mediator between God and man, the man Jesus Christ.	3. through the high-priest and guardian of our souls, Jesus Christ.

[2]Lake, op. cit., (AF), vol. 2, (xii, 3), p. 327.

[3]A. Roberts and J. Donaldson, The Writings of Tertullian, (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1869), p. 163.

1 Timothy 2:8 expresses another liturgical trait:

> "I desire then that in every place the men should pray, lifting holy hands without anger or quarrelling."

The idea of 'lifting holy hands' was typical of the day, whether pagan, Jewish or Christian. Some[1] have stretched the point in trying to find a parallel with Ephesians 6:14 and Philippians 1:27. Neither of these passages dealt with people standing to worship; yet, both lend thought to standing firm in one's faith. This is not what was expressed in the Pastoral passage. To 'lift' the hands meant to stand, with hands outstretched and palms upwards; and this was done while praying. This gesture of prayer was inherited by the Christians from the Jews. Even though the Jews kneeled at times in prayer (1 Kings 8:54), they also uplifted their hands (1 Kings 8:22). Clement (29:1) had mention of this also.[2] Justin Martyr's account of the eucharist also showed an account of this.[3]

Before leaving prayers, one needs to consider the evidence for prayers for the dead. Some have said that 2 Timothy 1:18 refers to prayers for the dead Onesiphorus.[4]

> "... may the Lord grant him to find mercy from the Lord on that Day - and you well know all the service he rendered at Ephesus."

They assumed he was dead, but nowhere was this said definitely. The inference was that we should remember him, because of his good deeds to Paul. But that does not mean he was dead. But, because of the date of these epistles, his death is assumed.

---

[1] Maxwell, op. cit., pp. 4-5; and Dugmore, op. cit., p. 80.
[2] Lake, op. cit., (AF), vol. 1, p. 57; "let us then approach him in holiness of soul, raising pure and undefiled hands to him, loving our gracious and merciful Father..."
[3] Hillard, op. cit., p. 21; quotes Justin Martyr.
[4] Lock, op. cit., p. 90; and Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 171.

Assuming Onesiphorus was dead this prayer shows again that the Christian faith did some borrowing. This type of prayer was sanctioned in Pharisaic circles since the date of 2 Maccabees (12:43-45). Also there were inscriptions in the Roman catacombs that prove the existence of such a practice.[1]

Probably the most characteristic liturgical phrases, that were similar to those of Paul, were the doxologies in the Pastorals. The form in these doxologies were customary, but there were changes that enforce our belief that Paul did not write them. The author of the Pastorals imposed on Paul's style his own thoughts. Basically there were four doxologies in number.[2] There was one at the end of each epistle, and one at the end of an introduction to the first chapter of 1 Timothy.

One of these doxologies was similar to those of Paul (1 Tim. 1:17;."be honor and glory for ever and ever."). Doxology endings similar to this one and ascribed to Paul, are Galatians 1:5, Romans 11:36, 16:27, Philippians 4:20, and Ephesians 3:21. The doxology was customary at these times. Paul, being a Jew, added expression of praise and reverence after uttering the name of God. Paul turned these conventional forms into acts of praise and prayers.[3]

The description of God as 'incorruptible' (1 Tim. 1:17), reflects Greek philosophical conceptions, but was used by Paul in Romans 1:23.[4] Similarly, in this doxology, the adjective, 'invisible,' when applied to God, finds a Pauline parallel in Colossians 1:15.[5] Kelly finds a parallel with Paul in 1 Timothy 6:16, with the description of God as 'dwelling in unapproachable light,'[6] but this was probably just a reference to Psalms 104:2,[7] or Exodus 33:17-23.[8]

---

[1]Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 171; and Lock, op, cit., p. 90; and Gayford, The Future State, (c. 4); and Wohlenburg, Acts of Paul and Thecla.
[2]1 Tim. 1:17, 6:16; 2 Tim. 4:18b; and Tit. 3:15b.
[3]Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 15.
[4]Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 56; and Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 67.
[5]Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 67.
[6]Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 146.
[7]Falconer, op. cit., p. 158.
[8]Lock, op. cit., p. 73.

Even the wording in 2 Timothy 4:18 are identical with Galatians 1:5.[1] So it is obvious that Pauline thought and method are found in the doxologies.

New features not found in Paul also appear. Nowhere did Paul use the phrase 'King of the ages.' It is found in the apocryphal writings and was probably used in Jewish prayers. Possibly this thought went back to the Babylonian idea of world periods or millenial cycles.[2] Tobit 12:10 expressed a Jewish cult-formula and was echoed in many Jewish prayers and can also be paralleled here. 1 Timothy 6:15 is full of Old Testament reminiscences, and is probably based on some doxology in use in the synagogue.[3] The stress in this passage is on supremacy of God over rulers, His possession of life and His majesty. This was brought out in contrast to heathen gods, or earthly kings.

The use of the word makarios (1 Tim. 6:15) was exclusive to the Pastorals in biblical Greek, although Hellenic parallels did exist.[4] We can see where the Greek metaphysical conception of God exerted its influence. The idea of 'happy gods' was frequent in Homer's time. The idea of God as independent of men and containing all happiness in Himself, was evident in Epicurus. Also this was found in Aristotle, Philo and Josephus.[5] 'Blessed' was applied by the Greek to his gods as implying a happiness beyond being touched by the ills that affect mankind. And in Ephesus, Artemis was worshipped as supreme in divine power and place, the goddess of generation, fostering the life of the wilds and the fields.[6]

---

[1] Some claim that there is a difference, in that the doxology in Galatians is addressed to God, whereas the present is addressed to Christ; but, Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 220; says there "is little or nothing in the context to bear this out."

[2] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 15.

[3] Lock, op. cit., p. 72.

[4] Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 116; Gerhard Delling, Worship in the New Testament, (Westminster Press, 1962, p. 63; 1 Timothy 6:16 is "attached to a solemn admonition to the recipient, which intimately points to God in the light of the parousia which he will bring about."

[5] Lock, op. cit., p. 13; Epicurus, Plut. 1103 D; Aristotle, Rep vii; Philo, de Spec. Legg. i, 209; Josephus, Ap. ii, 22.

[6] L. R. Farnell, The Cults and the Greek States, (Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1896), p. 480f.

Let us now move from the worship service in general to baptism. There are passages in the Pastorals that possibly shed light on this subject. Titus 3:4-7 states:

> "... but when the goodness and loving kindness of God our Savior appeared, he saved us in righteousness, but in virtue of his own mercy, by the washing of regeneration and renewal in the Holy Spirit, which he poured out upon us richly through Jesus Christ our Savior, so that we might be justified by his grace and become heirs in hope of eternal life."

Baptism to the Pastoral author was the method of salvation and new birth.[1] As a method of salvation we see that the aorist tense of the verb ('saved') indicates that it was a once and for all act.[2] Salvation is received, and it is not by our deeds but by His mercy.

Two specific things grew out of baptism to the Pastoral author. First, was regeneration. The thought of regeneration (rebirth) was commonly used by the Greek-speaking Jews, of the renewal to life in the resurrection after a world judgement. This designation of baptism as 'rebirth was reminiscent of the mysteries, but never used by Paul.[3] This was also a meaning extended from the use of the word by the Stoics for the periodic renewal of the world.[4] Oddly enough, the only other time regeneration was used was in an eschatological sense.[5] Secondly, the description of baptism was renewal. At baptism a Christian was to make a complete transformation or elevation to a new order of being.[6] He became a new creation at baptism. The Vulgate said this referred to the moment of baptism. But if it

---

[1] 1 Peter 3:21 also expresses this meaning of salvation. John 3:5 speaks also of new birth.
[2] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 251.
[3] Hans Conzelmann, An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament, (SCM Press, London, 1968), p. 49.
[4] Falconer, op. cit., p. 115; here, this 'regeneration' is similar to Paul's "new creation," in 2 Cor. 5:17, Gal, 6:15.
[5] Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 142; reference is to Matt. 19:28.
[6] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 252.

was governed by dia it might add the thought of daily renewal.[1] Possibly, but not too logically, it might refer to confirmation.

The point is that there is little doubt that baptism is referred to in Titus 3:4-7. It played a part in the liturgical aspect of the early church, but from the Pastorals, it is almost impossible to say to what degree. One assumes that baptism was the beginning for the Christian, and this author was concerned mostly with the results of baptism rather than its conditions.

Baptism of Timothy is referred to in 1 Timothy 6:12, where the author inferred that Timothy professed a good confession.

> "Fight the good fight of the faith; take hold of the eternal life to which you were called when you made the good confession in the presence of many witnesses."

The key to this passage may be found in the word 'confession.' A confession was usually made at a rite allowing the initiate to enter an organization or it was used at a trial. If this was a trial, the use of the word 'witness' probably would have been used. The idea here is two-fold. First, someone is being called, and secondly he is also professing a good confession. These two things go together. Even though the Pauline idea of the mystical union with Christ is missing, which is typical of the Pastorals,[2] there seems to be no other reason for doubting this to be a reference to baptism.

Other references that may refer to baptism do occur in another liturgical fragment, 2 Timothy 1:10. In fact, Hanson, feels it is not farfetched to suggest that the phrase "brought life and immortality to light" is a reference to baptism and the Eucharist.[3] This may just be contemporary Hellenistic

---

[1] Lock, op. cit., p. 155.

[2] H. G. Marsh, The Origin and Significance of the New Testament Baptism, (Manchester Un. Press, 1941), p. 196; disagrees and feels this Pauline message is in this passage.

[3] Hanson, op. cit., (S); refers to the Didache, Justin's Apology, and Hebrews to back his view, p. 98f.

vocabulary.[1]

Ordination is emphasized in 1 Timothy 4:14.

> "Do not neglect the gift you have, which was given you by prophetic utterance when the elders laid their hands upon you."

This form of ordination may have been adopted from Judaism.[2] The point here, as in baptism, is that there was ordination for men of Timothy's status. The question as to whether it was just Paul or a group of elders who ordained Timothy is immaterial at this point. The fact of ordination is the most important point. There is no indication here either concerning conditions of ordination.

It might be wise to note that charisma is used only in the Pastorals once (1 Tim. 4:14). This reference is either to the spiritual equipment one received at ordination,[3] or the office implied by the Spirit.[4] Both can be used, because at this time, Timothy may represent the end of the thought of just a spirit-filled charismatic ministry, and the beginning of the ecclesiastical office that was so often referred to in the Pastorals. It does not have to be an 'either-or' situation. The confirmation of this is found in two actions that occurred. First, we have the idea of the 'gift' as transmitted by prophecy, which gave charismatic influence to his call; and secondly, the more concrete outward indication of the 'laying on of hands.' This two-fold thought is frequently found in Acts (6:6, 8:17, 9:17, 19:6). This gives us indication again of the divine-human co-operation in the more developed church.[5]

---

[1] Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 96; This p. 149. [illegible] tic appearance of divine kings who bore the title of 'Savior,' and of religions which offered illumination and immortal life.

[2] Scott, op. cit, (C), p. 54; It was customary among the Jews in the consecration of judges, scribes, and members of the Sanhedrin, and was traced back to Moses (his hands on Joshua: Num. 27:18f); and Easton, op. cit., p. 149. 1964), p. 247

[3] John Calvin, Calvin's Commentaries, trans. by T. A. Smail, (Oliver and Boyd, London, 1964), p. 247.

Up until 1968, it was largely taken for granted that the Pastorals were not sacramental, although some suggested eucharistic elements. Then A. T. Hanson in his book, Studies in the Pastoral Letters, claimed there was direct reference to the eucharist in 1 Timothy 4:1-5, and probably a less direct one in 2 Timothy 1:10.[1]

> "Now the Spirit expressly says that in later times some will depart from the faith by giving heed to deceitful spirits and doctrines of demons, through the pretensions of liars whose consciences are seared, who forbid marriage and enjoin abstinence from foods which God created to be received with thanksgiving by those who believe and know the truth. For everything created by God is good, and nothing is to be rejected if it is received with thanksgiving; for then it is consecrated by the word of God and prayer." (4:1-5)

> "... and now has manifested through the appearing of our Savior Jesus Christ, who abolished death and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." (1:10)

Whereas most scholars feel this passage to be a reference to grace before a meal (1 Tim. 4:1-5),[2] Dibelius suggests possibly a eucharistic element.[3]

---

[4]Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 52f; Delling, p. 40.
[5]Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 97f.

---

[1]Hanson, op. cit., (S), p. 97f.

[2]J. G. Davies, A Select Liturgical Lexicon, (London, 1964); and Carrington, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 267; "The thanksgiving here seems to be connected with a fellowship meal rather than a purely sacramental occasion, unless indeed the two were combined, as they seem to be in 1 Corinthians;" and Hanson, op. cit., (C), p. 108; feels that this is a direct reference to the eucharist; and Lock, op. cit., p. 49; "This word is thought of as taken up in some word of scripture used from meal to meal, as grace;" and Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 93; cites Bernard as saying that this refers to the use of scripture before meals. "This seems more probable than the interpretation which maintains that 'the word of God' stands for 'divine revelation;'" and Falconer, op. cit., p. 140; "... the grace before meal, evidently in the family, though possibly the Agape;" and Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 68; and Parry, op. cit., p. 25; and Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 46; and Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 97.

[3]Dibelius, op. cit., He does not speak of "ein kultisches Motiv" and gives a cross reference to Didache 10, (p. 52).

Hanson's argument begins by paralleling 1 Timothy 4:3-5 with the Didache (chapters 9-10), even though they have different orders and sometimes variant phraseology. He says, after making references to Justin, that the author of the Pastorals was saying that we have no right to reject bread or wine as unfit for our use, "because God himself in Christ has sanctified these elements for our special use in the eucharist."[1] Hanson feels that Justin and the Pastoral author had a common source, or a common eucharistic and perhaps baptismal tradition. He strongly feels that the eucharist reference was in the background of what was said.

As far as 2 Timothy 1:10 is concerned, it too has parallels in the Didache, according to Hanson. The passage then suggests a reference to what "we today would call the two sacraments."[2] Therefore the phrase, "brought life and immortality to light" is a reference to the baptism and eucharist, and derived from a eucharistic prayer.

Hanson has done a valuable service for us with these suggestions but they seem to be made without realizing that the context of the references in the Pastorals deals with other material. 1 Timothy 4:1-5 was certainly a warning against the approaching apostasy not a reference to the eucharist. The author had come now to the forces against the church, and asked Timothy to deal with such forces. Therefore, the author mentioned the false teachers forbidding marriage, and abstaining from foods. He warned Timothy that such people were not thankful. God created all things good and nothing should be rejected, but should be accepted in a thankful way (or with thanksgiving). And certainly

---

[1] Hanson, op. cit., (S), p. 104; This is very much the same point as is implied in Didache 10, "where the prayer says that God has given good for the use of all men, but spiritual food for the special use of Christians in the eucharist."

[2] Hanson, op. cit., (S), p. 106.

2 Timothy 1:10 has no direct reference to any sacrament. It is just a summary of the main conceptions of the gospel as this author saw it. Therefore, it is my conclusion that the Pastorals are not sacramental in nature.

Women in the Pastorals play an important rôle also. One passage gives us evidence of part of this role in worship. 1 Timothy 2:9-12:

> "... also that women should adorn themselves modestly and sensibly in seemly apparel, not with braided hair or gold or pearls or costly attire, but by good deeds, as befits women who profess religion. Let a woman learn in silence with all submissiveness. I permit no woman to teach or to have authority over men; she is to keep silent."

Continuing from verse 8, women were to be in a spirit of prayer like the men. They should reveal this spirit in their whole demeanor. This included the costumes or clothes the women wore. The word used (katastolē kosmios) applied not only to dress but to the whole deportment.[1] By their appearance, women showed what frame of mind they were in.

To be modest and sensible constituted the truest adornment of a Christian woman. Modesty was that "shamefastness, or prudence, which shrinks from overpassing the limits of womanly reserve, as well as from the dishonor which would justly attach thereto." Sensibility (or sobriety) was that "habitual inner selfgovernment with its constant rein on all the passions and desires" that faced womanhood.[2] The suggestion was that all women should curb their aimless

---

[1] Falconer, op. cit., p. 130; "In Aristotle αἰδώς is that feeling which restrains from wrongdoing, a sense of reverence which keeps a man within appointed limits." In the Hellenistic Greek "it is almost synonymous with σωφροσυνη, as the conduct of the self-respecting, honorable person; in Epict. αἰδώς plays an important part in man's attitude towards God; the adjective αἰδήμων conveys one of his most important ideas in practical ethics, 'capability of feeling ashame,' 'moral reaction,' and in the realm of religion 'reverence before God;'" yet, Kelly, op. cit., (C); says this term is used only here in the New Testament and "connotes feminine reserve in matters of sex."

[2] Trench, op. cit., p. 71f.

thoughts and be in a mood of reverence. Possibly modesty may have reference to matters of sex, but this would still probably refer to outward appearance - such as dress, which could be called sexy. And sobriety definitely defined in a broad sense the simple idea of acting sensibly, which basically meant having control over oneself. Plato lists sobriety as one of his cardinal virtues.[1]

Not only were women to be modest in their feelings but also in their clothes. Elaborate hair styles, gold, pearls, expensive clothing were not to be worn. Braiding the hair was a regular feature of a fashionable woman, Jewish or pagan, in the Graeco-Roman world. Complaints about the costume of women in the Roman Empire were strong. Pliny said that imitation jewels were a thriving, fradulent industry.[2] The Christian woman was to avoid all luxury of costume and adornment.

A woman was to adorn herself with good deeds. Her inner character was one of good works. She was to be modest in her outward appearance, and inwardly, selfless to the world in service. Character was her Christian adornment. This was the outcome of her Christian faith. The inward and outward appearance of the Christian woman (or man) should go together. There must be dignity as well as spiritual worth.

A woman was also to learn in silence. In the Jewish synagogue silence was expected of women. This emphasis was because of an element of emancipation on the women's part. This was typically Pauline, for he required women to remain silent in Corinth.[3] This may just mean that women should learn in quietness as opposed to one who parades her finery.[4]

---

[1]Paul Shorey, Plato (The Republic, iv, 430e), vol. 1, (William Heinemann, London, 1946), p. 359.
[2]Falconer, op. cit., p. 130; quotes Pliny.
[3]1 Cor. 14:33-36.
[4]Falconer, op. cit., p. 131.

The place of women in the Pastoral Epistles reflects the place of women in the world of their day. In Judaism a woman had no legal rights and was classified as a thing in the complete power of her husband. In Judaism women were not educated at all; girls did not go to school. Therefore in Judaism obviously a woman would not teach.

In the Greek world a respectable woman led a very secluded life, not even joining the family for meals, but remaining in her own quarters. She never went out alone. A woman who wanted to teach would in the Greek world be a forward and unwomanly woman.

It may be that Christian women were trying to become emancipated too soon, which would simply get the church a bad name, and that the advice of Paul and the Pastorals was for the sake of social safety.

Christian worship in the Pastorals was a means of preserving and promoting sound teaching and doctrine. It became the means for Timothy and Titus to exercise the 'deposit' passed on to them.

It consisted of offering prayers (1 Tim. 2:1,8), reading scripture (1 Tim. 4:13, 2 Tim. 3:16), and teaching the doctrine of Jesus Christ (1 Tim. 4:13, 6:3, Tit. 1:1, 4). Recitation of faithful sayings (1 Tim. 1:15, 2:15, 4:8; 2 Tim. 2:11f; Tit. 3:4-7), hymns (1 Tim. 2:5,6, 3:16, 6:15, 16), and exhortation (1 Tim. 4:13, 2 Tim. 4:2; Tit. 1:9, 2:15) were a real part of the service.

The church worship continued to show Jewish influence, yet the difference was becoming apparent. The context of prayers, the confessions, the lifting up of Jesus Christ and the warmth and depth of the service, brought many from the synagogues and the cold ethical philosophies.[1]

The Pastorals are not basically sacramental. The outright statement of the observance of the eucharist is missing. The worshipping church in

---

[1]Falconer, op. cit., p. 63.

the Pastorals deals with the external aspects of the church worship, the regulation of the conduct of the faithful and the insistance of sound doctrine.

The great Pauline concept of the church as the body of Christ is missing, but the absence of this does not take away from the depth of the doctrine that must go on and continue to teach men truth and to glorify God.

SECTION FOUR: ETHICS

No period in history can stand in isolation. The influence which moulds everyone in each day and age cannot be severed from its past. Therefore, to study the ethics of the Pastorals, means to study the social, moral and religious environment of their period.[1]

The fiber of every era of history is strengthened or broken by its past. What created the environmental conditions, so characteristic of the Pastorals, was a period of history pregnant with momentous issues. This was a period in which the old order and the new were contending for mastery.

The change of leadership, though quite a revolution, changed the moral conditions little.[2] Even though materialism and social vice were rampant, it was a time of change, especially within the church. A great effort for a reform of conduct and passion to attain a deeper spiritual life also emerged during this period. A rule of conduct and higher vision were the result. And both the Roman and the Greek had much in common in this area.[3]

To study a segment of history means to study what preceded it, as well as its place in history. The period preceding the coming of Christ saw change at its best and worse. It was a period of far-reaching changes - political,

---

[1] This in turn means that whatever came before it moulded its reactions, and created its situation.

[2] Samuel Dill, Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius, (MacMillan Co., London, 1905), p. vi; "The revolution in the ideal of the principate, which gave the world a Trajan, a Hadrian, and a Marcus Aurelius in place of a Caligula and a Nero, may not have been accompanied by any change of corresponding depth in the moral condition of the masses."

[3] Usually these two powers are studied separately, but due to space and possibility, I will take them together, considering all social, moral and religious conditions as general, unless otherwise stated; W. W. Fowler, The City-State, (MacMillan and Co., London, 1911), pp. 1-10; states that there is a close relationship between Romans and Greeks. They, first, were not "too far distant from one another;" secondly, their "religious practices on which our knowledge of those ideas is chiefly based," and resemblance; thirdly, in regard to character, it was the unlikeness that drew them together; fourthly, they developed the "same kind of polity."

social, philosophical and religious.

> "During the ages stretching between the teaching of Aristotle and the baptism of Constantine mankind witnessed the fall of the 'polis' - that most wonderful and fruitful of the political experiments of ancient history; the meteor-like appearance of Alexander the Great; the rapprochement between East and West such as has never since been achieved; the growth and influence of the Jewish Diaspora; the chief path-finder for Christianity; the political supremacy of the West over the East for the first time and the establishment of the first western empire; the dissemination of Oriental mysticism and with it a world-renouncing ethic in the West; the prevalence for half a millennium of the 'Gnosis' conception of religion which left its indelible mark on Christian theology; the beginning and rapid spread of those voluntary associations for religious purposes and mutual support which have done so much to shape human society; the rise of the Roman Empire, the culminating factor in the consummation of 'the fulness of the time.'"[1]

This was a time when the Greek mind, still in its "full creative vigor," made a response to the failure of the world in which it had put its faith.

The reign of Alexander brought new life to the Greek. His conquests altered the whole course of world history.[2] After successful campaigns in a short span of time, he had shaken the ancient world from its past, and offered visions of its future. He had arrested the Oriental danger which threatened to swamp Western civilization, and extended the Greek culture as far as India. Alexander commenced the task of reconciliation among nations, and inaugurated that "comprehensive cosmopolitanism which reached its apogee in the Roman Empire."[3]

---

[1] S. Angus, The Mystery-Religions and Christianity, (John Murray, London, 1925), p. 2; also J. Kaerst, Geschichte des hellenistischen Zeitalters, vol. 1, (Leipzig, 1909), p. 408.

[2] G. H. C. MacGregor, and A. C. Purdy, Jew and Greek: Tudors Unto Christ, (Ivor Nicholson and Watson, London, 1936), p. 11.

[3] A. Angus, The Environment of Early Christianity, (Duckworth and Co., London, 1914), pp. 8-9.

One thing Alexander did that could never be undone was his ending the city-state. The Greek could conceive of no form of communal life unless it was the city-state, but he gave them a vision of something larger.[1] Even though many of them continued to exist, with all the interplay of party politics within them, the end of the city-state was soon to come.

The creation of the city-state was for the Greek, grand,[2] but it severed its own throat.[3] The result was the rise of individualism.[4] Individualism arose from the ruins of nationalism and the city-state.[5] For the city-state

---

[1] T. R. Glover, The Ancient World, (Cambridge at the Un. Press, 1936), p. 232.

[2] M. Cary, and T. J. Haarhoff, Life and Thought in the Greek and Roman World, (Methuen and Co., London, 1940), pp. 28-9; "Membership of the 'ecclesia' offered to the ordinary citizen regular and frequent opportunities of voicing his opinion, or at least of registering his vote; and since the total member of burgesses in a Greek state serfdom exceeded 10,000, the individual voter was free to feel that he could make a difference to the pace of the vote if he were to pull his full weight. The constitutions of plain citizen, and of keeping him continually interested in public affairs. The 'polis' was something more than a creditably efficient piece of administrative machinery; it was also a practical school of politics and of social co-operation. But the virtues of the city-state were apt to play over into vices, by cultivation to excess."

[3] T. R. Glover, Christ in the Ancient World, (Cambridge at the Un. Press, 1929), p. 23; "One city-state fought the other; one after another aspired to rule the rest; all in turn wrecked themselves in wild hopes, or sold themselves for a foreigners subsidy, or simply lapsed into virtual non-entity; also, Angus, op. cit., (E), p. 30; "The weakening and subsequent fall of the city-state involved a fearful crisis."

[4] S. J. Case, The Evolution of Early Christianity, (Un. of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1914), pp. 67-8; "The Hellenistic age with its enlarged arena for action gave great opportunity for the development of individualism. In the small city-state the citizen lived for the state, but a world-empire was too large and depended too little upon individual support to call forth the personal loyalty and service which had been so manifest in former times. The whole world was now the sphere of action for the individual, his primary motive for activity being his own personal welfare."

[5] Angus, op. cit., (E), p. 30.

"was substituted the idea of a world empire," and even though Alexander's successors never held more than a share of the conquests, they all felt they had the whole.[1] The result was a strike against collectivism, a decline in nationalism, and the loss of the 'society.'[2] Yet, on the positive side grew a strong sense of individuality and personality.[3] The Romans were destined to undergo a similar experience.[4]

The record of the early history of the Roman Empire is for the most part legendary. The national character reflected their iron-heartedness.[5] They excelled in law and government. They developed the needs of social organization into a body of clearly defined institutions and principles of civic government.

The history of Rome is one of continual wars, which caused many difficulties.[6] Roman morals began to disintegrate. This hastened the advent of a commercial era in society.[7] Another result of war was the increase of slavery.[8]

---

[1] W. R. Halliday, The Pagan Background of Early Christianity, (Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1925), pp. 152-3; says "individualism became a necessary corollary of universalism;" and Case, op. cit., p. 63.

[2] Angus, op. cit., (E), p. 25.

[3] Angus, op. cit., (E), p. 25.

[4] Case, op. cit., p. 64; "A republican form of government was adequate as long as the city of Rome was practically the nation, and while constant warfare against common foes fostered loyalty to the state. But the conquest of the Roman legions added so many distant provinces to the kingdom that the republic inevitably gave way to the empire with one ruler who was virtually an absolute monarch."

[5] W. G. deBurgh, The Legacy of the Ancient World, (MacMillan Co., London, 1923), p. 185.

[6] Angus, op. cit., (E), pp. 31-2; states that for 400 years BC the nations were engaged in "unintermittent wars. After the struggle of Greece against Persia began the internecine strife of the Greek states which ended in the exhaustion of all; then of the field of Chaeroncia Greece came under the heel of Macedonia. Alexander's world-conquests were followed by the struggles of the Diadochi until the Romans made a universal conquest. The Romans had carried on a long warfare to extend their rule over Italy. Finally the Roman civil war deludged the whole world in blood."

[7] Angus, op. cit., (E), pp. 32-3; "The many wars of this period told on society. The material resources of many cities and individuals were exhausted and comforts diminished, a fact which partly explains the spirit of revolution and rebellion, social distrubances being notoriously conditioned by

The social institution of slavery had social and moral effects.[1] All work became distasteful, especially to the Greek and later to the Roman.[2] The middle class began to disintegrate.

Serious social and moral difficulties grew out of the destruction of the middle class.[3] The absence of this class deepened the social cleft in

---

economic considerations;" yet, Case, op. cit., p. 68; reminds us that this was distinctly a commercial age, "still it was an age of intellectualism. Naturally it was less idealistic than Classical Hellenic culture had been, for realism is normal accompaniment of individualism."

[8] G. P. Fisher, The Beginnings of Christianity, (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1878), p. 193; "The country was blighted by slavery, to which more than to any other agency the fall of Rome was eventually due;" also, Case, op. cit., p. 69; explains it was an era of the "survival of the fittest," and the ranks of the unfortunates "were augmented by vast members of slaves, though the latter were often more favored in having a sure support from some good master;" and Angus, op. cit., (E), p. 35.

---

[1] Charles Bigg, The Church's Task Under the Roman Empire, (Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1905), pp. 111-2; states gradually the bulk of the population were slaves; and A. J. Church, and W. J. Brodribb, Annals of Tacitus, XV, (MacMillan and Co., London, 1879); and Edmund de Pressense, Religions Before Christ, (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1862), p. 158; the slave had no rights, even his children belonged to the master. "His life was held to be of such little value, that he was sacrificed on the slightest suspicion. All of the slaves in the house of a master who had been assassinated were put to death, and hundreds perished to prevent the murderer escaping;" and Ludwig Friedlander, Roman Life and Manners Under the Early Empire, (George Routledge and Sons, London), vol. 2, pp. 243-4; "Slavery as everywhere left its track of immorality very visible in Roman conjugal life, and made the standard of a mans fidelity too lax. Plutarch even says, advising a cultured newly married couple; the wife must not take it amiss, if the husband resort to a slave, but be grateful for his working his passions off on another woman, out of respect for her; just as the Persian kings used to dismiss their wives from the feast, and call in harlots and music players for their debauches;" and Cary and Haarhoff, op. cit., p. 128; "Slave traders by profession abducted unwary adults and picked up exposed infants, or brought the unwanted children of certain barbarian tribes. Finally, the supply was kept up by breeding. Under the Roman emperors, when other sources were being cut off by increased public security and lesser frequency of wars, the home-bred slaves probably outnumbered the rest." Also agarian slavery existed from the second century BC, and came to play a large part in Italy.

[2] Angus, op. cit., (E), p. 35.

the ancient world. The "compulsion of common needs" drew people together.[1] Guilds, social groups, religious societies[2] began to spring up in the cities.[3] Housing began to be a problem,[4] and poor tenement-houses towered the streets.[5]

> "I myself would even prefer Prochyta to the Suburra! For where one has ever seen a place so dismal and so lonely that one would not deem it worse to live in perpetual dread of fires and falling houses and the thousand perils of this terrible city,"

says Juvenal.[6]

The social conditions of the Graeco-Roman world were not stagnant in any way. For at least three centuries before Christ, the characteristic of the

---

[3] de Pressense, op. cit., p. 157; and Angus, op. cit., (E), p. 35f; This set in first in the Greek world, where the civil wars of the Greek states and the wars between the Greek kingdoms after Alexander had exhausted the free civic armies. In the East Rome completed the disastrous work. In Italy Hannibal had traversed the country exterminating the yeomanry. What Hannibal spared Rome's own wars in Italy destroyed."

---

[1] Franz, Poland, Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens, (Leipzig, 1909); and Ernst Troeltsch, Die Soziallehren der christlichen Kirche, (Tubingen, 1912), pp. 15f.

[2] Case, op. cit., p. 70.

[3] Angus, op. cit., (E), p. 36; "This occurred partly because of the decline of agriculture and small proprietorship, partly from ampler opportunities of making fortune when commerce became brisk, partly for the sake of adventure, and other causes."

[4] George LaPiana, "Foreign Groups in Rome During the First Centuries of the Empire," Harvard Theological Review, vol. xx, Oct., 1927, Num. 4, p. 207; "From the second century before Christ Rome was ever suffering for shortage of houses and living-accommodations for her rapidly increasing population."

[5] Ibid., p. 209; "Endless blocks of 'insulae,' poor tenement-houses, towering high on the narrow streets, were the result of the unavoidable overcrowding of the people in the central and cheaper districts."

[6] G. G. Ramsay, Juvenal and Persius, (William Heinemann, London, 1918), p. 33; and D. E. Eichholz, Pliny, (Nat. Hist.), (William Heinemann, London, 1962), xxxvi, 55, p. 139; "Ruinarum urbis ea maxima causa quod furto calcis sine ferumino suo caementa componuntur;" was his remark about the houses and their collapsing (poor material).

world was a growing cosmopolitanism.[1]

Greek civilization was seriously threatened by the incursions of the Northern Keltic barbarians into the Hellenic peninsula and Asia Minor.[2] They did not succeed, and Greek culture was saved. Decisive crises and social upheavals were the constant order of the day. Finally the power fell to the exclusive aristocracy.[3]

The virile energy, the virtue, which had carried Greece and Rome, began to crumble.[4] Juvenal speaks of:

> "The flattering, cringing, treacherous, artful race, of fluent tongue, and neverblushing face, a Protean tribe, one knows not what to call, that shifts to every form, and shines in all."[5]

---

[1] K. S. Latourette, The First Five Centuries, (Eyre and Spottiswoode, London, 1943); "The Persian conquests had paved the way for it, but its inception is usually dated from Alexander the Great. Although the empire which he built broke apart almost immediately after his death, the spread of the Hellenistic culture continued under the Greek rulers who made themselves heirs of the various portions of his realm;" also, Angus, op. cit., (MR), p. 17; "In speaking of this cosmopolitanism it is impossible strictly to separate cause and effect. It may be said to have been promoted by Alexander's deliberate policy of intermixing diverse populations; his studied fair treatment of all peoples under his sovereignty; the commercial activity which was stimulated by opening up new fields of enterprise and by putting millions of hoarded Persian bullion into circulation; by religious tolerance; and in a conspicuous manner by providing the first universal tongue for the whole civilized world in the Greek 'Koine.'"

[2] Angus, op. cit., (MR), p. 3.

[3] Cary and Haarhoff, op. cit., p. 70; this deliberately closed the door on 'new men.' "But this nobility proved unequal to the task of governing an empire. It was corrupted by a hard scramble for riches, and it was half-hearted and dilatory in the urgent business of enlarging and improving the machinery of government, so as to adapt it to the growing needs of an imperial state."

[4] Fisher, op. cit., p. 192; "Still proud of their blood, dexterous, supple, unprincipled, and accomplished in the art of catering to the appetite for amusement and sensual indulgence, they swarmed in Italy and Rome, and infected the whole atmosphere of domestic and social life with their pestiferous influence."

[5] Ramsay, op. cit., (Juv. Sat. iii), p. 31.

Luxury, cruelty, amusements, the decline of the family, sexual laxity, homosexuality, and slavery became common and morals rapidly declined.[1] The Graeco-Roman world was morally depressed.[2]

Luxury and extravagance[3] took their toll socially and morally.[4] They ruined the middle class, impoverished the masses, and finally became unrestrained luxury and voluptousness.[5]

---

[1] One mans view was that of Seneca; Roger L'Estrange, Seneca's Morals, (T. Osborne, London), pp. 281-8; felt that the corruption of the language was the inevitable result of the corruption of morals; and Augus, op. cit., (E), p. 36f; "In appraising the morality of the Graeco-Roman world we must keep in view the many causes producing moral disorder - centuries of political confusing, devastating conquests, the depopulation of fair regions, the diminutions of the free classes, the extermination of the middle classes, the enormous increase of slavery ... social upheavals arising from the fall of the national faith; the sudden irruption of unearned wealth, the rise of capitalism ... revolt of individualism, ... the civil wars of Rome, ... taxation."

[2] William Barclay, "Hellenistic Thought in New Testament Times," The Expository Times, vol. lxxi, No. 9, (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh), June, 1960, p. 281; "... the fact remains that in Graeco-Roman society the general atmosphere was one of vicious immorality, and that especially in the upper reaches of society and amongst the people who are apt to be copied by the crowd in their virtues and in their vices;" Dr. Barclay quotes Juvenal, i 3, 75, 86, 150; iii, 21; and Seneca De Ira, ii, 8, 9.

[3] de Pressense, op. cit., (RBC), p. 155; tells of the Roman life as a "grand life." He quotes Seneca, who speaks of houses "refulgent with gold; slaves attired in gorgeous vestments, circulated through them, opulence shone out in every corner, fountains shot up in sparkling columns in the banquet-rooms;" yet, Friedlander, op. cit., p. 131; disagrees; "These exaggerations flourish in an atmosphere which magnifies every thing Roman, good, or bad, ... a closer examination shows that the authoritative facts have been torted or misconstrued, and that this view must be taken with several grains of salt. This would be so, even if the facts were as fully credible, as their nature partially proves them not to be."

[4] Gerhard Uhlhorn, The Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism, (Sampson, Low, Marston, Searle, and Rivington, London, 1879), p. 105; "Wealth is not merely hazardous to the individual, it is also dangerous to a nation, doubly dangerous when it pours in suddenly, as in Rome, and has not been gradually acquired as the fruit of labor."

[5] Shorey, (Plato, Rep.), vol. 1, op. cit., p. 167f; felt it was wrong for a man to work and despise the state.

Luxury in dress came into vogue,[1] and fashionable Roman ladies spent lavishly on their adornment.[2] Gold, pearls, precious stones, ear rings and bracelets covered the Roman lady in an extravagant way.[3] In the early days, the woman remained at home, now she was "to see and to be seen."[4] As Juvenal put it, "Let money carry the day."[5] "Extravagance," said Tacitus, "had become excessive in every branch of expenditure."[6]

---

[1] Ramsay, op. cit., (Juv. Sat. iii), p. 45; "In Rome every one dresses above his means;" and Uhlhorn, op. cit., p. 99; and F. W. Farrar, The Early Days of Christianity, (Cassell and Co., London, 1884), p. 4.

[2] Uhlhorn, op. cit., p. 99; "A fashionable Roman lady protected her complexion with a fine artificial paste, which she laid at night on her face, and then bathed in ass's milk. Of artificial washes, sweetsmelling oils, salves, perfumeries, pigments there was no end."

[3] H. Rackham, Pliny (Nat. Hist.), vol. 3, (William Heinemann, London, 1947), p. 243; speaking of Lollia Pauline, "... not at some considerable or solemn ceremonial celebration but actually at an ordinary betrothal banquet, covered with emeralds and pearls interlaced alternately and shinning all over her head, hair, ears, neck and fingers, the sum total amounting to the value of 40,000,000 sesterces, she herself being ready at a moments notice to give documentary proof of her title to them;" and Barclay, op. cit. (June, 1960), p. 281; quotes Suetonius (Julius Caesar, i; Caligula, xxxvii; Nero, xxvii, xxx; and Vitelluis, xiii), concerning the incredible spending of money, and he adds: "And it has to be remembered that when all this was going on sometimes the populace were starving if the cornships from Alexandria were late, and the dole of corn delayed in its distribution."

[4] Roberts and Donaldson, op. cit., (De Spectar. 25), p. 31; "Seated where there is nothing of God, will one be thinking of his maker? Will there be peace in his soul when there is eager strife there for a charioteer? Wrought up into a frenzied excitement, will he learn to be modest? Nay, in the whole thing he will meet with no greater temptation than that gay attiring of the men and women. The very intermingling of emotions, the very agreements and disagreements with each other in the bestowment of their favors, where you have such close communion, blow up the sparks of passion. And then there is scarce any other object in going to the show, but to see and to be seen;" and John W. Basore, Seneca, (De Ira, III, xxxiii, 1), (William Heninemann, London, 1928), p. 333f.

[5] Ramsay, op. cit., (Juv. Sat. 1), pp. 11-13; "So let Tribunes await their turn; let money carry the day, let sacred office give way to one who came but yesterday with whitened feet into our city. For no deity is held in such reverence amongst us as Wealth; though as yet, O baneful money, thou hast no temple of thine own; not yet have we reared altars to Money in like manner as we worship Peace and Honor, Victory and Virtue, or that Concord that twitters when we salute her nest."

[6] G. G. Ramsay, Annals of Tacitus, (John Murray, London), p. 234.

> "Gluttony, caprice, extravagance, ostentation, impurity, rioted in the heart of society which knew of no other means by which to break the monotony of weariness, or alleviate the anguish of its despair."[1]

Extravagant dinners were a way of showing the depth of their wealth. The taste for luxury in food was unbelievable. Juvenal spoke of feast days and all the wonderful food that arrayed the table.[2] Nero demanded that his friends give expensive dinners.[3] Even the entry of Vitellius into Rome produced a dinner by his brother that was unbelievable.[4] And while this occurred, others starved in the cornfields.[5]

Cruelty was widespread.[6] This vice was fostered by the continuous growth of large slave households and the demoralising effect of the possession of arbitrary power to treat human beings as chattels.[7] Of the time of Tiberius, Suetonius said: "Not a day passed without an execution."[8] Cruelty reached its peak in the savagery of the gladiatorial games and in the activities of the 'delatores.'[9]

---

[1] Farrar, op. cit., p. 4.

[2] Ramsay, op. cit., (Juv. Sat. xi), p. 225f.

[3] J. C. Rolfe, Suetonius, (Nero, xxxvii), (William Heinemann, London), p. 131; One friend spent four million sesterces for a banquet for Nero.

[4] Ibid., (Vit. xiii), p. 267; speaks of this dinner: "... at which two thousand of the choicest fishes and seven thousand birds are said to have been served."

[5] Barclay, op. cit., (June, 1960), p. 281.

[6] Fisher, op. cit., p. 219; speaks of licentiousness and cruelty as the "two characteristic vices of the ancient society, which produced a brood of unnatural sins and crimes."

[7] Halliday, op. cit., p. 106; reminds us that Romans and Greeks differ here though. "It is easy to be over-sentimental about the ancient Greek, but the difference seems to me, this; that while the Greek was not too scrupulous where an object was to be gained by cruelty was abhorrent to him."

[8] Barclay, op. cit., (April, 1960), p. 208; He also quotes many others to emphasize this point. Also, June, 1960, p. 282; he shares that cruelty was definitely there but not accepted by all men.

[9] Ramsay, op. cit., (Juv. Sat. iv), p. 65; speaks of "Pompeius, whose gentle whisper would cut men's throats;" and Barclay, op. cit., (April, 1960), p. 209; "The emperors were only too glad to listen, and there were those who were always ready to provide information which could justify another judicial murder;" and Ramsay, op. cit., (Tacitus), p. 270; speaking of Valinius, "he so ingratiated himself by accusing distinguished persons..."

The amusements of the ancient world formed one of the darkest blots upon its moral character. The circus had its bad moments.[1] It became the mob's temple, place of assembly and ideal. The theater was quite immoral.[2] The gods were scoffed at and virtue was mocked. Worst of all was the arena,[3]

---

[1] Friedlander, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 19f; tells us of the expense of the circus. Also he says "to the mob, the circus was its temple, home, place of assembly and ideal." It became a god to the people. "It was in the course of the first century, partly as a consequence of the infatuation of Caligula, Nero and Vetelius, that the system grew up. Caligula's partisanship for the Greens has been mentioned; according to Dio, he had the Blue charioteers and horses poisoned;" and Fisher, op. cit., pp. 211f; reminds us that these great gatherings were a substitute for the assemblies where "the Romans had chosen their magistrates and regulated public affairs."

[2] Uhlhorn, op. cit., p. 120; In the theater, "virtue was made a mock of, and the gods scoffed at; everything sacred and worth veneration was dragged in the mire. In obscenity, unveiled and unambiguous, in impure speeches and exhibitions which outraged the sense of shame, these spectacles exceeded all besides ... everything was designed for mere sensual gratification," and Angus, op. cit., (E), p. 41; "Drama had its origin in Greece in religion, and Greek tragedy is still an unspent moral force." With the exhaustion of the Greek materials and mutual sympathy between poet and people; "the result was the rise of the 'fabula togata,' ... with a lowered moral tone;" and Fisher, op. cit., p. 212; "Theatrical performances had a powerful attraction, and exerted a vast influence. The character of these went from bad to worse." The dancers were an example; "and as the mimes were commonly of an unchaste and even obscene character, they had the most corrupting effect upon the morals of women and of youth."

[3] W. E. H. Lecky, History of European Morals, vol. 1, (London, 1913); says that the gladitorial games "continued for centuries, with scarecely a protest, is one of the most startling facts in moral history;" and R. M. Gummere, Seneca, (Ep. Mor.), vol. 1, (Harvard Un. Press, 1934), p. 31; even tries to ease the pain by saying it is through the games "that vice steals subtly upon one through the avenue of pleasure;" and Fisher, op. cit., pp. 213f; says the gladiatorial contests were the most "impressive sign of the state of moral feeling in the society which beheld these bloody games with increasing delight." Gladiators were trained, lodged in cells, had special diets in order to die before the people. Even slaves were sold for this purpose; and Uhlhorn, op. cit., p. 123; "Sacrifices were offered, soothslayers were questioned, even magical arts employed, in order to obtain the victory for the favorite party;" and Ramsay, op. cit., (Juv. Sat. xi), p. 235; and Angus, op. cit., (E), p. 43f; and Friedlander, op. cit., p. 76f; shares the general insensitiveness of the Roman world to the intrinsic barbarity of the gladiatorial shows and their demoralizing effect.

which was "altogether detestable."[1] The Graeco-Roman world was not only hungry, and needing to be fed; it was also idle, and needing to be amused.[2] Men found their amusements at the cost of others. Amidst all of this corruption some still despised the games.[3]

The place of women[4] played a great part in the decline of the family.[5]

---

[1]Bigg, op. cit., p. 117; "Their costs were gigantic, and formed a terrible burden on the coffers of the state and of individuals. It has been computed that more than a million a year of our money was spent upon gladiators alone, without taking Rome itself into the account, and in the capital, at one time, shows of one kind or another were given on more than half the days in the year."

[2]Fisher, op. cit., p. 211; "Bread and Games - 'Panem et Circenses' were the two things to which they felt they had a right."

[3]Barclay, op. cit., (June, 1960), p. 282; quotes Seneca and Pliny as sharing the idea of abolishing the games.

[4]Fisher, op. cit., p. 199f; "In Greece, women enjoyed relatively less freedom, and less influence in their families, in the age of Pericles than in the Homeric period ... In Rome, the wife from the first had a higher position in the household ... The Romans boasted that for the first 500 years of their history, there was no instance of divorce. But the old sentiments rapidly passed away under the influence of Hellenism and in the general decline of Roman character;" and Friedlander, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 241; "At the time of the last Civil Wars which caused an utter disruption of moral relations, Vellenius testifies irrefutably to the honor of Roman women;" yet, Barclay, op. cit., (June, 1960); quotes Demosthenes as saying: "We keep mistresses for pleasure, concubines for the personal services of daily life, but wives we have in order to produce children legitimately and to have a trustworthy guardian of our domestic property;" and W. H. Fyfe, Aristotle, (Poet., 15), (William Heinemann, London), p. 55; and Uhlhorn, op. cit., p. 97; "The female sex had a low position in Greece, was shut out from education, and took no part in any of the employment of men, in public life, in affairs of their country;" and T. G. Tucker, Life in the Roman World, (MacMillan and Co., London, 1910), p. 289; tells of the typical life of the woman, giving an objective and practical view of her and her problems.

[5]Cary and Haarhoff, op. cit., pp. 139-145; "The Greeks and Romans were originally organized in families of patriarchal type. They were minature states in themselves, under authority of the 'pater familias.'" Cary and Haarhoff disagree that the family deterioated - "it would be a sad mistake to generalize too freely from individual instances, of notorious evil living among the Greeks and Romans."

In Greece the woman never occupied the high place she did with the Jews and Romans.[1] The wife was a tool, the 'hetaira' a playmate,[2] and many times a refined one too.[3]

At first Rome was different. The place of the family, and the position of women was better.[4] Women had gained an equality with men,[5] and they were slowly gaining influence.[6] Finally there "supervened a gross laxity of sexual morals."[7] Men could lend their wife to friends, or borrow their friends' wife for a period.[8] Seneca said that women married to be divorced and were divorced to be married.[9]

Even the children suffered greatly.[10] Aristotle approved of exposing

---

[1] Angus, op. cit., (E), p. 44; "Although the Greek believed in monogomy he never held his wife in high honor;" and Fisher, op. cit., p. 199; "In Greece, women enjoyed relatively less freedom, and less influence in their families, in the age of Pericles than in the Homeric period."

[2] Angus, op. cit., (E), p. 144; "The Greek was not attracted to home life; he preferred the company of men out of doors and that of 'hetairai.'

[3] Fisher, op. cit., p. 200; They were "sometimes witty and educated." Probably the most famous was Phryne, who amassed such wealth that she could offer to build the wall of Thebes; and Angus, op. cit., pp. 44-5; and Fisher, op. cit., p. 98.

[4] Fisher, op. cit., p. 17 or pp. 199-200.

[5] Angus, op. cit., (E), p. 46; and Dill, op. cit., pp. 80-1; even said they attained equal rights in the field of authorship. Also, the influence of women in provincial administration was becoming a serious force.

[6] Dill, op. cit., p. 81.

[7] Angus, op. cit., (E), pp. 46-7; "Seneca tells of women who marked their chronology by the names of their husbands rather than by the counsuls. Marriage lost its sanctity; it was lightly entered upon because easily annulled;" and Uhlhorn, op. cit., p. 101; "Marriages now were effected as easily as they were dissolved."

[8] Angus, op. cit., (E), p. 46.

[9] L'Estrange, op. cit., (De Benef. iii, 16), p. 4f.

[10] Farrar, op. cit., p. 5; "No care could have prevented the sons and daughters of a wealthy family from catching the contagion of the vices of which they saw in their parents;" and Fisher, op. cit., p. 207; "Sometimes such children were left by the Greeks to perish by starvation in some desolate place; sometimes they were killed outright;" and Bigg, op. cit., p. 110; "The practice of infanticide, ruinous as it was to the Empire, was so deeply rooted in the ancient law of the home that even Constantine did not venture to prohibit it."

infants if the population was in excess, and Plato held that "children of bad men, illegitimate children, and children of parents too far advanced in years should be destroyed by exposure."[1]

Abortion was widespread also. "No law in Greece or in the Roman republic, or during the greater part of the Empire, condemned it."[2] Women and children suffered because of abortion.[3]

Sexual laxity was everywhere.[4] The vicious ladies of Juvenal were claiming sexual equality to sin, "while Musonius, the Stoic, was preaching a simple standard of chastity for men as well as women."[5] Epictetus cried for purity, but few listened.[6] Even Suetonius said of Julius Caesar, "that he was unbridled and extravagant in his intrigues."[7]

Homosexuality became the national disease. 'Paiderastia' was an outgrowth of the indulgent society, whose motto became, "to step aside was human."[8] Male prostitution in Greece was common, but with the Romans it was

---

[1] Shorey, op. cit., (Plato-Rep.), pp. 459-60; and Fisher, op. cit., p. 207.

[2] Angus, op. cit., (E), p. 47; "Abortion was widespread in all classes among the Greeks and Romans. Among the Jews child-murder and voluntary abortion were forbidden on pain of death. With the Greeks and Romans it was a matter of discretion."

[3] Halliday, op. cit., pp. 113-14; reminds us that there are two different pictures drawn by people like Pliny and the satirists; "strongly contrasted impressions."

[4] J. J. I. Dollinger, The Gentile and the Jew, (vol. 2, London), p. 289.

[5] Halliday, op. cit., p. 114; quotes Juvenal (ii, 44), and Stobaeus, Flor. vi, 61 and E. Zeller, Die Philosophie der Griechen, 3rd edition, (Leipzig, 1889), p. 737, concerning the teaching of Musonius. (One constantly has to keep in mind that Juvenal exaggerates to a degree; even so, it must be happening or there would be no mention of it).

[6] W. A. Oldfather, Epictetus, (Manual, 33, 8), vol. 2, (Wm. Heinemann, London, 1928), p. 519; (of course he adds "as far as you can," . . .and "if you indulge, take only those privileges which are lawful."

[7] Barclay, op. cit., (June, 1960), p. 283; "He had a son by Cleopatra, and so notorious was he in the provinces that in his triumph after the war in Gaul the soldiers, who on such occasions were allowed to sing ribald and insulting verses, say: 'Men of Rome, keep close your consorts, here's a bald adulterer; God in Gaul you spent in dalliance, which you borrowed here in Rome."

[8] Angus, op. cit., (E), p. 50.

gross. It was so common and so grossly disgusting as to defy and reject all excuse.[1] Suetonius spoke of Julius Caesar as the lover of King Nicomedes of Bithynia,[2] and he and Tacitus spoke of Nero's relationship with a castrated youth.[3] The result was celibacy, and this made its "disastrous contribution to the depopulation of the Empire."[4]

Slavery presented an ethical problem as well as a social one. The slave was not a 'persona,' but was a piece of property which could be conveyed.[5] Slaves were numerous in Greece and Rome,[6] and the effect of slavery on society

---

[1] Dollinger, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 289; "On the whole this vice exhibits a grosser aspect among the Romans than among the Greeks; with the latter it had often a dash of spiritualism mixed up with it; the sin, so to speak, was crowned and veiled with flowers of sentiment and of a devotion amounting to sacrifice. But in the Romans it came out in its naked filth; and Barclay, op. cit., (June, 1960), p. 284.

[2] Rolfe, op. cit., (Suetonius, Jul. Cae.), vol. 1, p. 67.

[3] Ramsay, op. cit., (Tacitus, books xi-xvi), pp. 272-3; "Nero disgraced himself by every kind of abomination, natural and unnatural, leaving no further depth of debauchery to which he could sink; except that a few days afterwards he went through a regular form of marriage with one of that contaminated crew called Pythagoras. He put on the bridal veil; soothsayers were in attendance; the dowry, the marriage bed, the nuptial torch were all there, with everything exposed to view--even the things that which night conceals as between man and wife;" and Rolfe, op. cit., (Suetonius, Nero, xxviii, xxix), p. 131 and p. 133.

[4] Angus, op. cit., (E), p. 51.

[5] W. W. Fowler, Social Life at Rome, (MacMillan and Co., London, 1908), pp. 222-223; "A slave was in the eye of the law not a 'persona,' but a 'res,' i.e. he had no rights as a human being, could not marry or hold property, but was himself simply a piece of property which could be conveyed 'res mancipi:'" and Basore, op. cit., vol. 3, p. 164; "interior illa pars mancipio dari non potest;" and Uhlhorn, op. cit., pp. 131-3; "not regarded as a man, he had neither free will nor any claim whatever to justice, nor any capacity for virtue;" and Angus, op. cit., (E), p. 39.

[6] Friedlander, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 219; "The great increase in the number of slaves necessarily led to extravagance; " and Cary and Haarhoff, op. cit., p. 127; reminds us that all ancient peoples had slaves but they were especially numerous in the world of Greece and Rome; and Bigg, op. cit., pp. 111-112; feels the numbers created a moral effect. "Gradually the bulk of the rustic population appear to have sunk into this miserable condition."

and life was multiple.[1] Slaves were ill-treated, yet justification was claimed by the great law of self-preservation.[2]

Slave labor diminished the necessity to work and this in turn led the rural population into the vices and idleness of the cities.[3] This is where the moral aspect of slavery was most serious.[4]

Juvenal spoke of the woman who hired servants to whip slaves, who ordered slaves to be crucified, and whipped the trembling maid who dressed her hair.

---

[1]Fisher, op. cit., p. 209; the slave could own no property or marry; "whatever connection he was allowed to form with a woman was dissolved at the command of his owner;" and Cary and Haarhoff, op. cit., p. 129; it brought suffering, overworked conditions, sometimes a lifetime of celibacy, and a "curious regulation of Greek and Roman law-courts prescribed that the evidence of slaves might be taken under torture . . .Servile rebellions were crushed without mercy; insurgents who had surrendered were sometimes crucified 'en masse.'"

[2]Edward Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, vol. 1, (Methuen and Co., London, 1897); "Against such internal enemies, whose desperate insurrections had more than once reduced the republic to the brink of destruction, the most severe regulations and the most cruel treatment seemed almost justified by the great law of self-preservation;" and Fisher, op. cit., p. 207; says treatment of slaves by the Greeks was milder than by the Romans.

[3]T. R. Glover, The Influence of Christ in the Ancient World, (Cambridge at the Un. Press, 1929), p. 28; "Slavery always kills initiative; why should a slave improve his master's tools or even take care of the tools he has? To turn men and women into devils, it is only necessary to enslave them. Negation and sterility beset ancient industry in field and town;" and Angus, op. cit., (E), p. 39.

[4]Fowler, op. cit., p. 232; reminds us that the result of all these different races (which were slaves from many different areas) was "the introduction into the Roman state of a poisonous element of terrible volume and power;" and Angus, op. cit., (E), p. 40; "Slavery proved in the end one of the causes of the downfall of Rome. After the cessation of Roman conquests, slavery fostered the cruel spirit bred by war and indifference to human suffering. . .Slavery innoculated society with a moral poison from which it never recovered."

> "It is well worth while to ascertain how these ladies busy themselves all day. If the husband has turned his back upon his wife at night, the wool-maid is done for; the tire-woman will be stripped of their tunics; the Liburnian chair-man will be accused of coming late, and will have to pay for another man's drowsiness; one will have a rod broken over his back another will be bleeding from a strap, a third from the cat; some women engage their executioners by the year. While the flogging goes on, the lady will be daubing her face, or listening to her lady-friends, or inspecting the widths of a gold-embroidered robe. While thus flogging and flogging, she reads the lengthy Gazette, written right across the page, till at last, the floggers being exhausted, and the inquisition ended, she thunders out a gruff 'Be off with you!'"[1]

The majority of the slaves were not treated in such a way. Owners learned to treat them humanely, and by the first century B.C. "they began to play on the hopes of reward rather than on the fear of punishment."[2] Some became free to marry, and create a domestic life.[3] Some were completely freed, and some became wealthy.[4] Yet, this group of freedmen also swelled the numbers of the needy and caused problems.[5]

---

[1] Ramsay, op. cit., (Juv., sat. vi), p. 123.

[2] Cary and Haarhoff, op. cit., p. 129; and Halliday, op. cit., p. 129; reminds us that in the second century, "we find ample evidence of a new and humane attitude, and the status of a slave was definitely improving; and Dill, op. cit., pp. 116-17; tells us of the better side of slave life, such as in the home of the younger Pliny, "where the slaves were treated, in Seneca's phrase, as humble friends and real members of the family, where their marriages were feted with general gaity, which their sicknesses were tenderly watched, and where they were truly mourned in death."

[3] Halliday, op. cit., p. 129; and Dill, op. cit., p. 116; this transition did not change overnight though.

[4] Case, op. cit., p. 69; "Slaves who were sometimes skilled laborers, tradesmen, or educators frequently obtained their freedom and became wealthy citizens;" and Uhlhorn, op. cit., p. 140; reminds us that once free he "shunned every relation which implied service."

[5] W. W. Buckland, The Roman Law of Slavery, (Cambridge, 1909); and Case, op. cit., p. 69; and Uhlhorn, op. cit., p. 139; "The freedmen were another very bad and pernicious element in the life of the Roman people. They were exceedingly numerous;" and Bigg, op. cit., p. 114; feels that finally art and literature were effected because the freedmen became leaders, some teachers and professors who came from the servile class. "The dignity of work was lost, because paid labor was thought unworthy of any freeborn man."

Bad as this sounds--and it was bad[1]--there was hope. Depression, many times, fortunately creates reformation.[2] Although there seemed to be an odd change of heart on the part of some, there still was a deep social problem. It would have been remarkable if the Graeco-Roman world had pulled out of this at all.[3]

Man was faced with something he did not like and tried to find an answer; of course too many times he turned to vice instead of to virtue. "Unassailable conviction" attracted him to virtue,[4] but men were caught in an ambivalent way towards vice. Man's moral consciousness was challenged--philosophy and religion filtered into decisions unconsciously, and consciously.

---

[1] Angus, op. cit., (E), p. 51; "There are yet other sombre colors that might be added to this gloomy picture--the frequency of suicide, the evils of chariot-racing, gambling, stupid public and private extravagance, the audacious indecency of the pantomine, the licence of the Floralia with its races of nude courtesans, the 'naumachiae' (naval battles fought by gladiators and criminals for the amusement of the public), lewd pictures and suggestive decorations."

[2] Hatch, op. cit., pp. 140-1; believes that the age in which Christianity grew was an age of moral reformation. "There was the growth of a higher religious morality, which believed that God was pleased by moral action rather than by sacrifice;" This is backed up by P. E. Matheson, Epictetus, (Diss. 1. 13), vol. 1, (Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1916); "When someone asked Epictetus how one may eat so as to please the gods, he said, If you can eat justly, with good feeling and, it may be, with self-control and modesty, may you not also eat so as to please the gods?" and Alice Zimmern, Porphyry, (The Priory Press, Hampstead, London, 1910), p. 39; "Godlike deeds should precede talk of God, and in the presence of the multitude we should keep silence concerning Him, for the knowledge of God is not suitable to the vain conceit of the soul. Esteem it better to keep silence than to let fall random words about God."

[3] Angus, op. cit., (E), p. 37; "It would be a remarkable world that such causes would not shake to the very foundations. Yet, in face of all this, in the old world life, as ever, was rising from the death;" and Fisher, op. cit., p. 191; "The world was weary with strife."

[4] F. W. Bussel, School of Plato, (London, 1896), pp. 87-8; says man's "final test of the highest Truth is not dialectic; it is unassailable conviction, so soon to appear as the final criterium in Stoicism."

The supreme gift of Greece to the world was the earliest philosophers. But only when Socrates arrived, did the "main line of inquiry" become diverted from the nature of matter, to human nature itself.[1]

Socrates,[2] Plato,[3] and Aristotle[4] made their indelible marks, although different from ours,[5] still very human and very real. The foundations which were laid by these Greeks provide the background for every ethical system. For, "before the golden age of Greek philosophy there was no ethics in the strictest sense."[6]

---

[1] MacGregor, and Purdy, op. cit., p. 239; "... from physics to ethics, from mechanism of the universe to the determination of good and evil in human conduct."

[2] P. M. Huby, Greek Ethics, (MacMillan and Co., London, 1967), p. 1; "Socrates of Athens (469-399), after a lifetime of active moral teaching was put to death on being convicted of impiety and corrupting the young. He wrote nothing himself, but is portrayed in a long series of works by Plato, of which the earlier one probably give a faithful picture of his methods, and in the Memorabilia and other works of Xenophon."

[3] Ibid., pp. 1-2; "Plato, also of Athens (427-347), was a disciple of Socrates and wrote a large number of dialogues, in most of which Socrates is the chief speaker; among them the Alcibiades I - perhaps not written by Plato, but a good introduction to his doctrines - Hippias Major and Minor, Charmides, Laches, Lysis, Euthydemus, Euthyphro, Apology, Crito, Gorgias, Meno, Phaedo, Symposium, Protagoras, Republic, Philebus, and Laws all contain something of importance for ethics."

[4] Huby, op. cit., p. 2; "Aristotle of Stagira (3840322) came to Athens in 367 and studied under and worked with Plato for twenty years. His writings cover a wide field. The Nicomachean Ethics is probably also his, but the Magna Moralia attributed to him is in fact of later date. His Politics is also relevant."

[5] Huby, op. cit., p. 3; "We have to remember that their basic moral and religious outlook was different from ours, and that what they valued and admired was sometimes very different from what we value and admire. At the same time these differences must not be over-emphasized; the Greeks, like us, were human beings, and shared the common lot of humanity, which must provide the raw material for all ethical systems."

[6] A. B. D. Alexander, Christianity and Ethics, (Duckworth and Co., London, 1914), pp. 35f; "The Sophists may be regarded as the pioneers of ethical science ... While Socrates was the first to direct attention to the nature of virtue, it received from Plato a more systematic treatment. Platonic philosophy may be described as an extension to the universe of the principles which Socrates applied to the life of the individual" ... and "the ethics of Aristotle does not essentially differ from that of Plato ... After Aristotle philosophy rapidly declined, and ethics degenerated into a popular moralising which manifested itself chiefly in a growing depreciation of good as the end of life."

The Greek spirit began to shake itself free from the view of the world involved in traditional religious ideas of the time, and undertook to "found a new concept on pure thought and intellectual knowledge."[1] This gave rise to two opposite interpretations of moral life.[2] The philosophy that changed from physics to ethics, from the mechanism of the universe to the determination of good and evil, had a new relevance to the human situation. To meet the human need of political, social and moral distress, it had to become moral philosophy. In this area it "acquired the new emphasis which it was for long to retain."[3]

From the end of the fourth century BC onwards,[4] two main streams of moral philosophy arose.[5] On one side was the Epicurean, on the other were the Cynic and Stoic. Two minor streams, the Sceptics and Cyrenaics also had a following of fair significance.*

The Sceptic marked all dogma with a query.[6] "No sense impression can be

---

[1] Albert Schweitzer, Civilization and Ethics, (A. and C. Black, London, 1923), p. 34; "Simple faith in the gods is felt to be unsatisfying, not only because the processes of nature do not find a sufficient explanation in the rule of the dwellers of Olympus, but also because these personalities no longer correspond to the moral experience of thoughtful men."

[2] Alexander, op. cit., (CE), p. 42; "The Stoics selected the rational nature as the true guide to an ethical system, but they gave to it a supremacy so rigid as to threaten the extinction of the affections. The Epicureans, on the other hand, fastening upon the emotions as the measure of truth, emphasised the happiness of the individual as the chief good - a doctrine which led some of the followers of Epicurus to justify even sensual enjoyment."

[3] Barclay, op. cit., (June, 1960), p. 284.

[4] E. Zeller, The Stoics, Epicureans and Sceptics, trans. by O. J. Reichel, (Longmans, Green and Co., 1880), p. 16; "An age like this did not require theoretical knowledge, it required to be morally braced and strengthened. If this desiderata was no longer to be met with in the popular religion in its then state; if amongst all the cultivated circles of philosophy had taken the place of religion, it was only natural that philosophy should meet the existing need."

[5] Gilbert Murray, Stoic, Christian and Humanist, (C. A. Watts, London, 1940), p. 55.

[6] Edwyn Bevan, Stoics and Sceptics, (Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1913), p. 123; says this was true of the founder, Pyrrho of Elis, he was a contemporary of the men who founded the two great dogmatic systems of Stoicism

* Dr. Russell suggests that the major streams be placed first. This would mean moving pp. 159 - 162 ahead of pp. 156-159.

certain." We are all in a state of mental rest, in which no one can deny or affirm anything,[2] was the Sceptics' view. This movement was stronger in pre-Christian time,[3] but it reappeared, over and over again because of its defensive powers in argument.

Even the existence of the gods was uncertain to the Sceptic, but, "following the custom, we affirm that there are gods, and that they exercise a providence and we honor them."[4] The Sceptics disputed that the existence of the gods could be proved.[5]

The Sceptic stood outside, looking in at religion. He had a blind attachment to tradition, and a lack of sincere conviction.[6] Therefore, he could not cope with vital religious questions.

His whole thought centered around epocha, and this was his main emphasis for centuries.[7] Every question had a suspended judgement. "You need not mind not knowing."[8] It is a mental attitude, which knows the equal weight of

---

and Epicureanism. "We cannot be exactly sure what he taught, since he left no writing and stands rather as a strong problematic figure at the back of the Sceptical tradition, just as Socrates stands behind the Platonic;" and Uhlhorn, op. cit., p. 51.

---

[1]Barclay, op. cit., (June, 1960), p. 207; "The Sceptics arrived at this position from the belief that there is nothing in this world which is indisputedly certain. No intellectual conclusion can be absolutedly certain."

[2]R. G. Bury, Sextus Empiricus, i, 10, (William Heinemann, London, 1933), p. 9.

[3]Angus, op. cit., (MR), p. 12; "Scepticism from the third century BC until the first century AD was even stronger than in the previous period, but this was the counterpart to a sturdier faith."

[4]Bury, op. cit., (iii, 2).

[5]Friedlander, op. cit., vol. III, p. 87.

[6]Case, op. cit., pp. 257-8.

[7]Zeller, op. cit., (SES), p. 521; says the Sceptic felt the right attitude in any decision was to withhold judgement. "The necessary result of suspended judgement is imperturbability;" and Barclay, op. cit., (July, 1960), p. 297; and Case, op. cit., p. 257; "Its ideal was never to interpose one's opinion, to approve only what seems most probable, to compare together different views, to see what may be advanced on either side, and to leave one's listeners free to judge without pretending to dogmatize."

[8]Bevan, op. cit. (SS), p. 124f; this was apparently Pyrrho's gospel.

things opposed, and in view of this, suspends judgement, "and therefore finds ataraxia, repose and tranquility of soul."[1]

The Cyrenaic school was founded in Cyrene, and was one of the earliest attempts to base the conduct of one's life on the pursuit of individual pleasure.[2] Aristippus, its founder, was an avid follower of Socrates.[3]

The good life was found in nothing but pleasure.[4] This was the one thing manifestly desirable, and which all mankind (or creatures) did desire and did choose, unless they were perverted.[5] It was this immediate pleasure that they sought that sometimes gave them the name Hedonikoi.[6]

Enjoyment was the only end in itself, and only pleasure was an unconditional good.[7] Everything else was good and desirable only in as far as it was a means to enjoyment.[8] "I classify myself," said Aristippus, "with those who wish for a life of the greatest ease and pleasure that can be had."[9]

---

[1] Barclay, op. cit., (July, 1960), p. 297; quotes Sextus Empiricus, Outlines i, 8.

[2] James Hastings, Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, vol. iv, (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1911), p. 383; and Huby, op. cit., p. 64; Aristippus taught that the goal of life was pleasure, and he developed his lines of thought similar to those of Plato and Aristotle; "accepting that there was a neutral state between active pleasure and active pain, they taught that only active was good to be pursued."

[3] R. D. Hicks, Diogenes Laertius, ii, 65, vol. 1, (William Heinemann, London, 1925), p. 195.

[4] This does differ with Socrates, for he felt that one should search for the truly good, and yet he left undetermined what this true good might be.

[5] Hicks, op. cit., (Diog. Laert. ii, 87, 88, 89), vol. 1, pp. 217f.

[6] Barclay, op. cit., (Oct. 1960), p. 28; and Hastings op. cit., (E), vol. vi, p. 567; says historically, ethical Hedonism was explicitly propounded by Aristippus of Cyrene, a founder of the school of Cyrenaics, and a disciple of Socrates.

[7] E. Zeller, Socrates and the Socratic Schools, trans. by O. J. Reichel, (Longmans, Green and Co., 1877), p. 347; quotes Aritippus in Xen. Mem. ii, 1, 9.

[8] Hicks, op. cit., vol. 1, (Diog. Laet. ii, 91), p. 221; and Walter Miller, Cicero, (De Officiis, iii, 33), (William Heinemann, London, 1938), p. 397f.

[9] Barclay, op. cit., (Oct. 1960), p. 30; he quotes from Xenophon, Mem. II, i, 9; and Zeller, op. cit., (SSS), p. 385; "Aristippus declared that pleasure was the only good, understanding by pleasure actual enjoyment, and not mere freedom from pain; and, moreover, making the pleasure of the moment, and not the state of man as a whole, to be the aim of all action."

Pleasure, to the Epicurean,[1] was the chief good.[2] This pleasure could be attained by anyone who sought it wisely. Their ethical system was concerned solely with how one should live this present life in pleasure.[3]

Epicurus followed the Cyranaic school concerning seeking pleasure. It was the 'ataraxia' pleasure that man should strive for.[4] His doctrine was a form of quietism.[5] Pleasure was the beginning and end of a happy life.[6]

The good life to the Epicurean was one of rational enjoyment of all the satisfactions which the world afforded.[7] It meant no fear of gods or demons.[8] They believed in gods,[9] but had no fear of them. It also meant no fear of death.[10] "By pleasure, we mean the absence of pain in the body and trouble in the mind."[11]

---

[1]This philosophy is named after its leader, Epicurus (for his life, see: A. J. Festugiere, Epicurus and His Gods, (Paris, 1946); and N. W. DeWitt, Epicurus and His Philosophy.

[2]C. K. Barrett, The New Testament Background: Selected Documents, (SPCK, London, 1956), p. 72; reminds us that this pleasure is not sensual or individualistic pleasure though; yet, Barclay, op. cit., (Dec., 1960), p. 78; says that luxury is their aim; and Halliday, op. cit., p. 159; calls it happiness.

[3]Huby, op. cit., p. 66; "There was no need therefore to fear punishment or hope for reward after death, nor to expect any intervention by the gods during lifetime."

[4]Huby, op. cit., p. 66f; "Instead of active pleasure, he recommended the calm middle state, which he called 'ataraxia' - which we may perhaps translate 'tranquillity;'" and Halliday, op. cit., p. 159; this was a freedom from disturbance, "which could be attained by the exercise of a wise and enlightened self-interest."

[5]Halliday, op. cit., p. 159; says this type of happiness is not obtained by self-indulgent Hedonism and the mere gratification of the sense, but rather by the suppression of need, appetites and desires."

[6]R. W. Rivingstone, The Mission of Greece, (Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1928), p. 16; "We need pleasure when its absence gives us pain: when the pain is absent, the need of pleasure ceases; yet, Barclay, op. cit., (Dec. 1960), p. 80; calls "happiness" the end of all teaching.

[7]de Burgh, op. cit., p. 178.

[8]Case, op. cit., p. 260; "He affirmed that neither gods nor demons had anything to do with creating the world, they had no hand in its maintenance, and no power either to harm or to help human beings;" and Barclay, op. cit., (Dec., 1960), p. 80.

[9]John Digby, Epicurus' Morals, (Sam Briscoe, London, 1712), p. 76f.

[10]Barclay, op. cit., (Feb., 1961), p. 101f; continues to say that the great enemy of tranquillity was fear - the two great fears were gods and death. "It is to eliminate these two fears that the whole system of Epicurus is constructed."

> "For it is not continuous drinkings and revellings, nor the satisfaction of lusts, nor the enjoyment of fish and other luxuries of the wealthy table, which produce a pleasant life, but sober reasoning, searching out the motives for all choice and avoidance, and banishing mere opinions, to which are due the greatest disturbance of the spirit."[1]

The Stoics grew out of the school of the Cynics.[2] The difference is one of education and culture rather than doctrine.[3] Areta was the good, and nothing else had any worth, to the Cynic.[4]

The Cynic preached their gospel to all who would listen.[5]

> "The true Cynic when he has ordered himself thus cannot be satisfied with this; he must know that he is sent as a messenger from God to men concerning things good and evil, to them that have gone astray and are seeking the true nature of good and evil where it is not to be found, and take no thought where it really is."[6]

The Cynic was not to embark on work without divine guidance, not to have the excitement of passion; he must purify his mind, despise his body, give up dread of death; he must give up external things, and be without the distraction of worldly care; he must have tact and acuteness, and above all be free from

---

[11] Barclay, op. cit., (Feb. 1961), p. 148; quotes Diogenes Laertius, x, 131; Cicero, Tusculan Disputations, ed., J. E. King, xix; 'not the excitement of the moment, but permanent tranquil satisfaction.'"

---

[1] Digby, op. cit., p. 76f.
[2] Zeller, op. cit., (SSS), p. 284; "The Cynic, like the Megarian School, arose from a fusing of teachings of Socrates with the doctrines of the Eleatics and Sophists."
[3] Murray, op. cit., (SCH), p. 57; "The Cynics were the Stoics of the slum and the street corner. They were like the Buddhist mendicant monks as compared to the Buddhist philosophers."
[4] Murray, op. cit., (SCH), p. 58; "Virtue was a direct relation of the naked soul of God."
[5] Fisher, op. cit., p. 188; "They perambulated the streets and highways, offering their doctrine and their rebukes to whomsoever they chose to address."
[6] Oldfather, op. cit., (Epictetus, Diss., xxii, 23), vol. 2, p. 137f.

vice.[1]

The Cynic was a missionary of morality.[2] His home was modest, and he had nothing to conceal. He sought happiness.[3] Nothing was good but virtue, nothing an evil but vice.[4] Man's armour was intelligence and virtue,[5] and he was only free if he had no external ties and no desires for things without.[6]

Stoicism had the same basic premises, that "nothing but Goodness is good," but they built out of this a true system of ethics.[7] In that spirit, Zeno[8] wrote his Republic.[9]

This philosophy appealed to the more serious Roman mind.[10] This was Cynicism, systematized, provided with a philosophic basis, "and accommodated

---

[1]Oldfather, op. cit., (Epictetus, Diss. xxii, 22), vol. 2, p. 137f; and Fisher, op. cit., pp. 188f; reminds us that "few, if any, fulfilled the lofty ideal which the Stoic age presents of one who undertakes to reform and guide his fellowmen. Yet it is interesting to know that such an ideal was exhibited, and that, here and there, an individual was found who made some near approach to the realization of it;" and Friedlander, op. cit., p. 273; said that Demetrius and Demonax, both realized this ideal.

[2]Friedlander, op. cit., p. 271; "The truly noble personalities in their ranks, who for the sake of their lofty mission renounced all worldly goods, were the objects of an equally general admiration and respect."

[3]Zeller, op. cit., (SSS), p. 302; reminds us that "happiness being in general distinguished from virtue, or, at least, not united to virtue, they regard the two as absolutely identical."

[4]Hicks, op. cit., (Diog. Laert. vi, 104-105), p. 107f.

[5]Hicks, op. cit., (Diog. Laert. vi, 12-3), p. 13; "Virtue is a weapon that cannot be taken ... Wisdom is a most sure stronghold which never crumbles away nor is betrayed."

[6]This is what Diogenes says of himself in Epictetus, Discourses, iii, 24, 67.

[7]Murray, op. cit., (SCH), p. 59; "All that matters is the goodness of man's self, that is, of his free and living will. Goodness is to serve the purpose of God, to will what God wills, and thus co-operate with the purpose of the Cosmos;" and Hicks, op. cit., (Diog. Laert. vii, 40), p. 151.

[8]Barclay, op. cit., (March, 1961), p. 164; was the founder, came from Cyprus, of which he was most proud.

[9]Murray, op. cit., (SCH), p. 60; "He conceived a world-society in which there should be no separate States; one great 'city of gods and men,' where all should be citizens and members of another, bound together not by human laws but by Love;" and Halliday, op. cit., p. 130; says that two cardinal principals are in Stoic doctrine: 1) "the essential unity of the universe, of which all men are parts; 2) the demands of self-respect."

[10]Glover, op. cit., (PR), p. 210; tells us that whatever its antecedents and whoever its followers, it was intensely Greek.

to the practical needs of human society."[1]

To the Stoic, a man was happy when what he willed existed.[2] Therefore, happiness was the correspondence of what existed with the Will. Also, they believed that each person had a divine element within him.[3]

Another developement of Stoicism was their conception of the natural equality of men, of man's "subjection to a universal law."[4] They made free use of allegory and myth,[5] yet midst all of this, logic came first.[6]

"If virtue depends on knowledge, and if vice is wilful and culpable ignorance, then it follows that virtue can be won by an effort of the mind, and by the acceptance of the necessary discipline which the gaining of it involves."[7] Virtue was all man needed,[8] because it was conformable to Nature,[9] said the Stoic.

---

[1] Rivingstone, op. cit., p. 38.

[2] Bevan, op. cit., (SS), p. 28; "Zeno asked in effect what happiness really was, and he found it - this is the essential point - not in a particular sort of sensation or sum of sensations, as men were apt to suppose, but in an attitude of the Will ... It was in terms of Will that Value was to be interpreted;" and de Burgh, op. cit., p. 179; and Zeller, op. cit., (SSS), p. 225; says "Happiness ... can only be sought in rational activity or virtue."

[3] Dill, op. cit., pp. 390-1; This linked him with the cosmic soul, "and through which man might bring himself into harmony with the great policy of gods and men;" and Case, op. cit., p. 263; says the Stoic god is inseperably linked with the world - "in him we live, move, and have our being;" and Barclay, op. cit., (May, 1961), p. 230; the Stoics taught that man was god-filled, living in a god-filled world.

[4] Huby, op. cit., p. 69; "On the one hand, this led to complete determinism; as part of the natural order man was subject to the laws of nature - in our modern sense - and his life was completely determined: his only choice was between submitting willingly or being compelled." Otherwise, "Universal Law was something behind and better than the laws of individual states; the Stoic could imagine and aim at an ideal community in which all distinctions of rank or race were abolished."

[5] de Burgh, op. cit., p. 180; "They were experts in accomodation."

[6] Zeller, op. cit., (SES), p. 70f; and Barclay, op. cit., (April, 1961), p. 201; quotes Epictetus, Discourses, I, xvii, 6.

[7] Barclay, op. cit., (July, 1961), p. 292; Virtue is therefore the product of the will, of training, of progress.

[8] H. Rackham, Cicero, (De Finibus, V, xxvii), (William Heinemann, London, 1914), p. 483; and Murray, op. cit., (SCH), p. 63.

[9] Zeller, op. cit., (SES), p. 227.

The ideal Stoic was Epictetus. He was born a slave woman's son, and for many years was a slave himself.[1] He was the chief preacher of this moral reformation.[2] His doctrines were the conventional ones of Stoicism.[3]

> "I find in Epictetus," says Pascal, "an incomparable art to disturb the repose of those who seek it in things external, and to force them to recognize that it is impossible for them to find anything but the error and the suffering which they are seeking to escape, if they do not give themselves without reserve to God alone."[4]

Another area of thought was Gnosticism.[5] It was the product of the world's religious ideas and convictions, and syncretistic in form.[6] There were many types of Gnosticism, and very few scholars agree as to specific categories.[7] As Jonas says of the Gnostics:

> "The abstruseness of their speculations, in part intentionally provocative, does not diminish but rather enhances their symbolic representativeness for the thought of an agitated period."[8]

Its religious nature, saving knowledge, transcendent conception of God, dualism, and mythological approachwere the main features that characterized

---

[1] Oldfather, op. cit., p. vii.
[2] Hatch, op. cit., p. 142.
[3] For his doctrines in summary see Oldfather, op. cit., p. xx.
[4] Oldfather, op. cit., p. xxvii; quotes Pascals and von Wilamowitz (Kultur der Gegenwart, I. 8, 244); "For it is doubtful if there was ever a Christian of the early church, who came as close to the real teaching of Jesus as it stands in the synoptic gospels as did this Phrygian."
[5] Hans Jonas, The Gnostic Religion, (Beacon Press, Boston, 1958), p. 32; "The name 'Gnosticism' which has come to serve as a collective heading for a manifoldness of sectarian doctrines appearing within and around Christianity during its critical first centuries, is derived from 'gnosis' the Greek word for 'knowledge.'"
[6] W. C. van Unnik, Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings, (SCM Press, London, 1960), p. 36.
[7] Two different lists are from the following: R. M. Grant, Gnosticism, (Collins, London, 1961), p. 16; and Rudolf Bultmann, Primitive Christianity, (Living Age Books, Meridan, New York), pp. 162-3.
[8] Jonas, op. cit., p. 31.

this thought.[1] This thought or heresy (to the Christian) spread across time limits and geographical barriers. This was another thought pattern the early Church had to face.

This leads us to consider the religious conditions of this period. Greek and Roman alike were conscious of a dependence on some supernatural element in life, even though there was open denial of the gods.[2] Literature, dedications, inscriptions, all emphasized the rule of the gods over mankind. Cities, organizations, cults and families all had their deities.[3] And when one failed, a substitute was found. It was a religious transitional stage,[4] similar to the political, economic, social, and moral transition.

---

[1]For further reference on main features see: MacGregor and Purdy, op. cit., p. 313; and Jonas, op. cit., p. 31; and Grant, op. cit., (GEC), p. 12; and H. C. Sheldon, History of the Christian Church, vol. 1, (Thomas Y. Crowell and Co., New York, 1894), p. 205.

[2]Cary, and Haarhoff, op. cit., p. 301; "In the fifth century BC, some Greek Sophists pointed out that religious beliefs are not capable of logical demonstration. In the third century a Greek poet named Euhemerus virtually denied the reality of gods by asserting that all of them were dead men arbitrarily defiled. At the same time the Epicurean philosophers openly attacked religion, because in their opinion it was a source of fear and unhappiness among mankind, and although they did not formally repudiate the existence of gods, they denied their intervention in human affairs."

[3]Cary, and Haarhoff, op. cit., p. 302; "Every Greek and Italian city had its patron gods and a highly organized apparatus of state worship. Every public or private club was in outward form at least a religious society, and not a few of them had the cult of some deity as their main object. Every family had its own religious observances: Greek houses commonly contained an altar of Hestia (the goddess of the hearth), and Roman dwellings a shrine of the Lares (protectors of the homestead), and of the Penates (gods of the storeroom);" and Hatch, op. cit., p. 292; explains that the religious societies had the same aim as Christianity - "the aim of worshipping a pure god, the aim of living a pure life, and the aim of cultivating the spirit of brotherhood;" and Allan Menzies, History of Religion, (John Murray, London, 1911), p. 276; says that each house had its Hestia (goddess of the hearth), and carried on its worship which in other Aryan peoples is connected with the memory of departed ancestors."

[4]Angus, op. cit., (E), p. 68; "Men were in a dangerous transition stage - between collectivism and individualism, between a cramping polis and a universal state, between a political and a personal-ethical religion, between the religion of nature and that of revelation."

The decadence socially and politically, and the sceptical philosophical thought was accompanied by a fall and decay in religion, especially in Rome. Disaster, wars, incendiarism, defilement of sacred rites, adulteries, and "the sea was filled with exiles" was the grim picture painted by Tacitus.[1] Superstition, and a resort to magic were rampant.[2] Life became almost unbearable for some, who found no freedom in the philosophies.[3]

The Greeks and Romans needed an authority for the human spirit.[4] They floundered amidst the formalism which dominated the religious services. Finally a widespread disgust with life developed - a "taedium vitae."[5]

Generally speaking many types of religions emerged or continued. One was the "political" religion of the imperial cult or the State religions of Greece and Rome.[6] Other religions were the "ritualistic-sacramental" religion (represented chiefly by mystery religions and later by Christianity), religions of divine revelation, religions of Gnosis, the "individualistic-ethical type"

---

[1] C. H. Moore, Tacitus, (The Histories, vol. 1), (William Heinemann, London, 1925), p. 7

[2] T. R. Glover, The Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire, (Methuen and Co., London, 1909), pp. 15f.

[3] H. J. Rose, Ancient Greek Religion, (Hutchingson's Un. Lib., London, 1946), p. 166; "On the other hand the more sophisticated minority only followed these masters of philosophy in their ridicule of popular superstition, and showed no taste for the uplifting moral teaching which most schools, especially those of the Epicureans and Stoics, enjoined."

[4] Angus, op. cit., (E), p. 70; "They had lost all faith in their state religion. Of the Greek oracles some were quite silenced, others were still visited, but there was a marked diminution of inquirers. Roman augury and state divination were abandoned for more private methods. Roman ecclesiastics tried to retain the masses by introducing popular and emotional rites. But the Greeks and Romans never had gone to their priests for guidance."

[5] Angus, op. cit., (E), p. 71; "A rising sense of personality brought pain. Selfindulgence was one of the many antecedents of satiety. While men were healthily occupied in public and national affairs, the cry of the individual was not heard. The misery and poverty caused by the Roman conquests and civil wars destroyed the basis of a regular social life. Idleness brought its concomitant - weariness."

[6] S. Angus, The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World, (John Murray, London, 1929), p. 22; and Bigg. op. cit., p. 37.

(Stoicism), the "ethical-mystical" type (found chiefly in Neo-Platonism and Neo-Pythagoreanism), and Astralism (the religion of astrology).[1]

The keynote was universalism.[2] The demand finally came for a catholic religion. Philosophy had left "speculation to play its part in supplying religious guidance on strictly human and universal lines."[3] Even if universalism was the keynote, division was there to stay. Greece had its philosophical approach, Rome its political approach, and the Orient its emotional approach. The Roman spirit ruled in the domain of government and law, the Greek in art and science, and Oriental impressed itself upon religious life.[4]

The religious life was directed by its environment. Socially and morally the Greek and the Roman reacted to the setting which in turn gave rise to religion - the mystery of it, as well as the comfort found in it.

Religious interests occupied the minds of man.[5] Man continued to look for, and sought to gain religious satisfaction.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 22; and Boll, Die Erforschung der antiken Astrologie, ("N. Jahrb. f. d. klass. Alt." xxi), p. 112; states Astralism was less distinctive but penetrated other religions.

[2] Angus, op. cit., (E), p. 83; "The demand was for a universal religion. The isolation of the individual revealed common human needs;" and Uhlhorn, op. cit., p. 21.

[3] Angus, op. cit., (E), p. 83.

[4] Uhlhorn, op. cit., pp. 20-21; "Thus this part of the mighty Empire had a share in its internal growth, and was all the more important since the real and highest end for which the Empire existed must be sought for in religious developement."

[5] F. Legge, Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity, (Cambridge: at the Un. Press, 1915), p. xlix; "There has probably been no time in the history of mankind, when all classes were more given up to thoughts of religion, or when they strained more fervently after high ethical ideals; also, Dill, op. cit., p. 82; states that even though scandals and horrors of the Dionysiac orgies went on, and the purity and peace of families was at stake; that "the world was in the throes of a religious revolution, and eagerly in quest of some fresh vision of the Divine, from whatever quarter it might dawn;" and E. Aust, Die Religion der Romer, (Munster, 1899), p. 107; speaking of this age says, "the hero is less honored than the saint; the religious movement puts its seal upon the century;" and K. Lake, The Stewardship of Faith, (Christophers, London, 1915), pp. 75f; "The men of the first century were essentially religious; they were constantly seeking not so much after God as after an adequate theology and satisfying worship to stimulate the spiritual life of which they were

> "In the ever-increasing asceticism and other-worldiness; the sustained efforts made to surmount Dualism; the rapid spread of Mysteries which taught men to find symbols of the spiritual in the material; the 'theocrasia' which sought satisfaction for spiritual longings from whatever quarter; the urgent call for salvation and appeals for redemption-religions; the active religious missionary spirit and street-preaching; the burdensome sense of sin and failure; the earnest attempts to solve the enigmas of life and penetrate the mystery of the grave; in these and other features familiar to the student of the Graeco-Roman period are revealed the aspirations of this ancient world for a pragmatic view of god and the world upon which, in the phrase of Cicero, men might 'live with joy and die with a better hope.'"[1]

Greek religion was characteristically polytheistic.[2] Its roots were probably a fusion of the Indo-Germanic and Aryan with the Semitic and Hamitic elements.[3] The religion of the Greek was also anthropomorphic.[4] He considered

---

conscious, and experience of God which they enjoyed;" and Edwin Hatch, The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages Upon the Christian Church, (Williams and Norgate, London, 1898), p. 292; speaks of the societies as a "part of the great religious revival which distinguishes the age;" and Case, op. cit., p. 31; states "We do not always realize that Christianity arose in a very religious world ... The religions of the Roman Empire in the first century AD were not so completely decandent as has oft been imagined. This was in reality a period of remarkable religious activity;" yet, E. de Pressense, The Ancient World and Christianity, (Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1887), p. 424; disagrees, "The social and moral conditions of the Roman world at this period is the best proof of the fallacy of the so-called restoration of religion."

---

[1] Angus, op. cit., (MR), pp. 4-5.

[2] Rose, op. cit., (AGR), p. 18; "Its gods were fairly numerous, and most of them are clearly defined figures, whose functions are less sharply differentiated than their personalities;" and Edward Caird, The Evolution of Religion, (James Maclehouse and Sons, Glasgow, 1893), p. 261; tells us that polytheism often arose "by the coalescence of many kinships into a wider society, or by the conquest of one kinship by another;" and de Pressense, op. cit., (AWC), p. 395; says that polytheism was secretly undermined but not openly overthrown."

[3] C. P. Tiele, Outlines of the History of Religion, trans. by J. E. Carpenter, (Trubner and Co., London, 1888), pp. 205f; "The history of the Greek religion is one of the most striking examples of the great law that the richness and elevation of religious development are porportional to the opportunities of intercourse on the part of one nation with others, and the completeness of the fusion of races;" and Menzies, op. cit., p. 275;

man as the highest natural being, and regarded his nature as that which is most like to the divine.[1] But the Greek, in his religion, knew both too much and too little; he knew "too much to believe fully in gods, and too little to worship another god."[2]

The religion of Greece was one in which "Beauty was consecrated in worship," and the sensuous represented in rich symbolism.[3] Among the symbolic figures

---

"The primitive elements of Aryan religion all reappear in Greece's, the combination of many small household worships with the supra-family worship of a great god or gods, the few great gods who are surrounded by a multitude of spirits, some of these also growing into gods, the recognition of spiritual presences in many a natural object, living or dead;" and Caird, op. cit., p. 261f; and G. F. Moore, History of Religions, vol. 1, (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1914), pp. 410-11.

[4]Caird, op. cit., p. 264; but he reminds us that it is "as with a clear consciousness of that distinction;" and Menzies, op. cit., p. 281f; anthropomorphorising took freer play with them than with other people. "Thus, the spirits of the fountain and tree, and of every part of nature that was worshipped, took human form;" and E. W. Hopkins, The History of Religions, (The MacMillan Co., New York, 1918), p. 489; says the gods are not abstractions, but are anthropomorphic deities.

---

[1]Caird, op. cit., p. 264; "It is the first which distinctly levels nature up to man, instead of leveling man down to nature. It, therefore, not only 'personifies' the natural powers which it lifts to heaven but 'humanises' them."

[2]de Pressense, op. cit., p. 395; "He knew too much to believe fully in gods, and too little to worship another god."

[3]Angus, op. cit., (RQ), p. 160; and Menzies, op. cit., p. 276; "The gods of Greece in fact had their origin in that view of nature as animated in every part, which the Greeks shared with other branches of the Aryans, and with early man generally. Like the Latins, the Greeks at first saw a mystery, a spirit, in every part of life; each fountain had its nymph, each forest glade its dryad; and they felt the gods to be returning to fresh life when spring came with its flowers;" and Angus, op. cit., (MR), p. 13; The Greek religion appealed only to one side of mans nature, the aesthetic. "A religion of Beauty and Joy, it offered no message to men in the perplexities and sorrows of life; it was almost dumb as to a hope beyond death."

was Zeus,[1] whose power was unlimited and was not bound in any way by any recognised restraint. Most closely connected with him was Apollo and Athena, who constituted with him a supreme triad. Zeus was the protector of the political and social groups from the state to the household, and took "especial cognizance of moral relations among men."[2]

The humanization of the Greek Olympic gods was Greek religion at its best.[3] As Homer has stated: "Forever heretofore have they been wont to appear to us in manifest form, when we sacrifice to them glorious hecatombs, and they feast among us, sitting even where we sit."[4] In fact this probably was the most important influence of the epics on religion. They made

---

[1]Tiele, op. cit., p. 214f; "Even his consort Hera, who generally opposes him, can effect nothing but by and with him. Vainly does his brother Poseidon strive to establish similar prerogatives." Tiele continues by reminding us that amidst this monotheism is monarchism, because even though there are other gods, Zeus is still the power and all the gods are little less than representatives;" and Moore, op. cit., p. 413; "The greatest god in all branches of the Hellenic stock was Zeus, and his preeminence undoubtedly dates from the remotest antiquity;" and Menzies, op. cit., pp. 286-7; says he rules in Olympus and possesses all wisdom; yet, Angus, op. cit., (MR), p. 10; has a lesser view of Zeus--"was only a 'primus inter pares,' unable to trench upon the province of associate or satellite dieties, or to deflect the fixed course of Fate."

[2]Moore, op. cit., p. 416; "As Xenios he watches over and vindicates the obligations of hospitality, fundamental among which is the sacredness of the guest's person; as Horkios he presides over oath-taking and visits the breach of faith with condign punishment; as Hikesios he is the refuge of the suppliant, the man-slayer seeking asylum, the persecuted fleeing from his oppressor;" and Caird, op. cit., p. 269; reminds us that Zeus finally was looked upon mainly as a god of justice, "the source of all rightful order and authority in the state."

[3]Menzies, op. cit., pp. 281-2; calls this the "first great contribution made by this gifted race to the progesss of religion." Greece gave these gods human motives, human passions, human beauty, and human wisdom and goodness; and Cary and Haarhoff, op. cit., p. 308; tells us that ghosts and demons are not in Homeric religion; "it seems to have been acquainted with the worship of dead men, and it took little account of sacred trees and animals."

[4]A. T. Murray, The Iliad, vol. 1, (Wm. Heinemann, London, 1924), p. 37; and A. T. Murray, Homer, vol. 1, (Wm. Heinemann, London, 1946), p. 247.

the gods human,[1] which in turn made them morally responsible.

Public worship in Greece was at the descretion of each city.[2] Because of this and other factors, Greek religious ideas were transitionary in character.[3] They involved an unstable equilibrium between the objective and the subjective, the natural and the spiritual, the particular and the universal.

By the fifth century BC, the old religion, as far as the educated were concerned, had in its essence passed away.[4] A religious awakening occurred.[5] Religion was expressed in terms of ethics. Greek philosophy became the religion for many.

The Romans also had a religion. Even though it is said that Greek religion conquered Rome, Italy had an older religion, "which was not annihilated by the more brillant newcomer, but remained beside it and never entered into entire fusion with it."[6]

---

[1] Moore, op. cit., p. 431; "They are, indeed, superior to men in beauty and strength, in knowledge and in magical arts; they have a different fluid in their veins and subsist on other food; but, they are, after all, beings of the same kind and of like character. The necessities of the epic carry the anthropomorphic tendency of religion to its farthest limit;" and Angus, op. cit., (MR), p. 10; "The main features of the old Homeric faith were pantheistic polytheism and anthropomorphism which made religion reach humanized personalities."

[2] Cary and Haarhoff, op. cit., pp. 311f; still reminds us that "the chief gods of the Homeric pantheon, such as Zeus and Apollo, had temples in a great number of towns, and their cult was in some instances organized on a far wider basis than that of the individual 'polis.'"

[3] Caird, op. cit., p. 275.

[4] Menzies, op. cit., p. 298.

[5] Angus, op. cit., (E), p. 73f; "Man's religious nature was not dead. The practical tendencies of the age are especially active in religious things;" and Menzies, op. cit., p. 298; says the "conscience as well as the mind of Greece awakes at this period, and Greek religion becomes inspired with a deeper feeling. The simple objectivity of the Homeric spirit is gone in which man could frankly worship beings like himself and not very far above himself ... whether it was due to the anxiety and depression felt in Greece during the century before the Persian wars, or to foreign influences, or mainly to the natural growth of the Greek mind itself, religious phenomena of a new kind now appear."

[6] Menzies, op. cit., p. 305; yet, Tiele, op. cit., pp. 228f; says that the religion of the Romans and the Greeks were very closely connected. "The traces of agreement would certainly be still more numerous, had not the difference

At first their religion was an affair of the 'pagus,'[1] and had little to do with the individual.[2] The number of its deities was very large in the earliest form of state religion.[3] In contrast to the religion of Greece, the religion of Numa did not endow its deities with human shape or envisage them clearly.[4]

> "The deities of Rome were deities of the cult only. They had no human form; they had not the human heart with its virtues and vices. They had no intercourse with each other, and no common or permanent residence; they enjoyed no nectar and ambrosia ... they had no children, no parental relation ... These deities never become indèpendent existences; they remain cold, colorless conceptions, 'numina' as the Romans called them, that is, supernatural beings whose existence only betrays itself in the exercise of certain powers."[5]

The Roman religion was basically archaic compared with the Greeks. The

The Romans produced no cosmological myths, and very little poetry.[6] It was a

---

in national character and in outward circumstances led each of the two religions to develop itself for a considerable time in exactly opposite direction, till the nations came once more into contact with each other, and their religions blended together."

---

[1]E. E. Kellett, A Short History of Religions, (Victor Gollancz, London, 1933), p. 102f; it was a collection of homesteads - "it was an area, distinctly marked off from other areas, and loosely ruled as 'one;' it contained an indefinite number of 'familiae' or households;" and W. W. Fowler, The Religious Experience of the Roman People, (The MacMillan Co., London, 1911), p. 87; tries to define it thus: "The exact meaning and origin of the word has been much discussed. It is tempting to connect it with 'pax, paciscor,' and make it a teritory within whose bounds there is 'pax.'"

[2]Angus, op. cit., (MR), p. 31; quotes Giles, Roman Civilization, and he says that it was basically a family religion. Also Angus says that "each family constituted a little church, on the riligion of which that of the State was modelled."

[3]Cary and Haarhoff, op cit., p. 314f; the 'religion of Numa' was the earliest form of state religion. It was so called this "from the second Roman king, who was traditionally believed to have organized the public worship of the city."

[4]Cary and Haarhoff, op. cit., p. 315; "In some cases it was even uncertain about the sex of the god, and it possessed none of the rich mythology that attached to the Greek gods."

[5]Fowler, op. cit., (RE), p. 157f; translates Aust's book on Roman religion.

[6]H. M. Gwatkin, The Knowledge of God, (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh), vol. 2, p. 129; "... no poetry worth mention gathered around the old religion;" and Menzies, op. cit., p. 310.

religion of a practical, unimaginative, and patriotic people.[1]

Oddly enough, there was never any basic conflict between religion and state in Rome.[2] As Cicero stated:

> "Among the many divinely-inspired expedients of government established by our ancestors, there is none more striking than that whereby they expressed their intention that the worship of the gods and the vital interests of the state should be entrusted to the direction of the same individual, to the end that citizens of the highest distinction and the brightest fame might achieve the welfare of religion by a wise administration of the state, and of the state by a sage interpretation of religion."[3]

Before the great change in the religion of Rome, all seemed well. Rome had an earthly and political religion. Because of this it was little adapted "to quicken the deeper aspirations of the soul, or to awaken in the conscience that holy dissatisfaction, which would lead it to seek something higher and better than it had yet either attained or conceived."[4] The death of the old gods was on the way.

The great crisis in Rome's religion, a crisis which ended in disaster, came

---

[1] Hopkins, op. cit., p. 533; and Aust, op. cit., p. 14; and J. L. Myers, A History of Rome, (Rivingtons, London, 1910), p. 281.

[2] Th. Mommsen. History of Rome, trans. by W. P. Dickson, (Richard Bentley, London, 1862), Book I, chapter xi, p. 168; "The clan and the family were not annihilated in the Roman community; but the theoretical as well as the practical omnipotence of the State in its own sphere, was no more limited than by the liberty which the State granted and guaranteed to the burgess. The ultimate foundation of law was in all cases the State; liberty was simply another expression for the right of citizenship in its widest sense."

[3] N. H. Watts, Cicero, (The Speeches), (William Heinemann, London, 1935), p. 133.

[4] de Pressense, op. cit., p. 416.

during the Hannibalic Wars.[1] The old simplicity of Rome disappeared before the extravagance and selfishness of its people. Political interest outweighed religious interests.[2] It still lacked the vital spark which would have enabled and encouraged it to meet the hope of religious experience. The people fled again to strange gods, and religious indifference was widespread everywhere.[3]

Men were in search for salvation from any source which would produce it. Rome had no redemption-religion to offer, while Greece had been looking to the Orient or to her philosophies. This was where the Eastern faiths gained ground.

Oriental mysticism and emotionalism gained an entry.[4]

---

[1] Kellet, op. cit., pp. 104-9; "The war with Hannibal, the too easy conquest of the east, the rapid influx of wealth not earned by labor, the irresponsibility of the proconsuls, and the examples of tyranny and rapacity set by them, all these causes and many others, had produced their natural effects ... The corruption was rank;" and Angus, op. cit., (MR), p. 32; says it was more disastrous to Roman religion and morality than the Peloponnesian War had been to Hellas. During this period Rome's spirituality reached its lowest ebb. The distress and terror caused by Hannibal, the thirst for conquest, the luxury arising from abundant spoiliation, the civil wars with their proscriptions and confiscations, the tolerance of Greek thought, and infection of Greek scepticism, brought about a religious annemia for which the state religion offered no remedy;" yet, Fowler, op. cit., (RE), p. 336; says that religion played a role and directed them in a course of action; and Hopkins, op. cit., p. 535; would say that it is difficult to say when the old Roman religion began to change.

[2] Aust, op. cit., p. 59; "Ancient vulnerable cult-usages surrounded the Roman religion with a strong dike, but the waves of the Hannibalic War overflowed it;" and Angus, op. cit., (MR), p. 32f; Henceforth, "the religion of State and that of the people go their own ways. Every effort was made to lessen the distance between the 'di indigetes' and the 'di novensiles,' but the former continue to retreat until they retain their place only so far as they have been identified with the foreign deities, or survive in the pages of poetry, or in the lore of antiquarians;" and Cary and Haarhoff, op. cit., p. 319.

[3] Angus, op. cit., (MR), p. 35; "The ignorant had recourse to superstitions and foreign cults; the learned turned to foreign philosophies, the noblest form of which was that Stoicism of Roman type founded by Panaetius and Posidonius, taught later by Seneca, and lived by Marcus Aurelius."

[4] Angus, op. cit., (MR), p. 36.

> "How thoroughly religious sentiment had disappeared from the heart at the end of the republic is evident from the fact that the leading men of the State did not hesitate to scorn openly venerable usages in the most shameless fashion ... We see the State religion degraded to a menial of politics, the educated filled with the spirit of unbelief, or of scepticism, the masses serving foreign gods or sunk in superstition. A degenerate age stands unintelligent before the ruins of its faith and the usages of its forbearers."[1]

The mystery religions began to spread over the Graeco-Roman world.[2] Their influence was met with mixed feelings,[3] probably because of their prominent features.[4] The official, national religion lost its taste,[5] because, one day the god might be Caligula,[6] the next Nero,[7] and no matter who

---

[1] Aust, op. cit., p. 90.

[2] Cary and Haarhoff, op. cit., p. 321; and Murray, op. cit., (SCH), p. 69f; says that the most important of all of these religions was Mithraism. It hardly touched Greece. It came from Cilicia and Pontus, after 61 BC. "From thence onward it was carried by a stream of slaves and captives to Rome and the Mediteranean ports, and still more by a stream of soldiers out to the legions." It arose in the east among the poor, slaves and captives. It failed in 257 AD, in the Dacian Revolt, in a military disaster. "Mithras proved too weak to withstand the barbarians. He was no longer the unconquered."

[3] Angus, op. cit., (MR), p. 44; says there were four stages in the history of the Mysteries, and during the imperial period, they came into universal favor only under the Syrian emperors, when they were elevated into the rank of state religions; and Cary and Haarhoff, op. cit., p. 321; "Despite the sympathy of individual emperors for some of the religions of the Near East, these never obtained a secure footing amid the official Roman cults. Nevertheless they penetrated the Roman world by various private channels."

[4] Angus, op. cit., (MR), p. 45f; says the prominent features were symbolism, redemption, gnosis, divine drama, eschatology, rebirth (religious) and had a cosmic character to them; and G. Andrich, Das antike Mysterienwesen in seinem Einfluss auf das Christentum, (Gott, 1894), p. 24.

[5] de Pressense, op. cit., p. 433; "It had sunk too low."

[6] Rolfe, (Suet. Cal., 10), op. cit., p. 417.

[7] Church and Brodribb, op. cit., (Tac., Annals, xiv), pp. 256f; speaks of Nero, as one who never neglected the performance of a single crime.

he was this official god would "with a nod and a frown govern earth and sea, and command peace or wars."[1] Impiety was rampant,[2] while superstition increased.[3]

"The imperial era was marked by a rapid increase in the power and prestige of Eastern religion."[4] The worship of Isis, Attis, and Mithra flourished. These presented in religious theory and ritual practice some striking resemblances to Christianity, and this was noticed by the Apologists of the second century.[5]

The general drift of the imperial era was toward Oriental ways. The empire thus brought the Graeco-Roman world into a position which made it fertile soil for Eastern faiths. A mystery religion was a religion of symbolism, redemption, gnosis, Sacramental drama, eschatology, and had a personal and cosmic touch to it.[6] All this appealed to many.

---

[1] de Pressense, op. cit., (AW), p. 433; quotes Pliny, Panegyr., 197.

[2] Ramsay, op. cit., (Persius, sat. II), pp. 334f; speaks of the worshippers purchasing their favor with the gods. "What is the price by which you have purchased a kindly hearing from the god?" (p. 337); and Church and Brodribb, (Tacitus, "Annals," op. cit., xiv. 64), p. 284; speaks of a young girl, after putting her to death, will render solemn thanks to the gods; and Rolfe, op. cit., (Suetonius, "Caligula," v), p. 409; tells us that when a great disaster occurred, altars were torn down, and sometimes even the penates were cast out upon the highway.

[3] Murray, op. cit., (SCH), p. 64f; says even though it hardly appears in the classical writers, does not mean it's not there. "We do not need the testimony of Epicurus, Lucretius, the early Christian fathers, or Theophrastus, . . .to show the prevalence, and strength of superstition. It is shown by many incidents in history, and brought home by the religious inscriptions of mystical and magical literature;" and Valerius Maximus, Epit. 3, 4; shows how superstition had a firm grip on some people; and de Pressense, op. cit., (AW), p. 435; feels that superstition often assumed "the character of gross fetishism."

[4] Angus, op. cit., (MR), p. 37.

[5] F. C. Burkitt, Christian Beginnings, (University of London Press, London, 1924), p. 49; quotes Justin (Apology, I, 66).

[6] Angus, op. cit., (MR), pp. 45-67.

One of the most influential Oriental religions was astrology, or astralism. It was religious in its origin and its principles.[1] It was the belief of astralism that men's lives were fixed and determined by the influence of the stars, from which there was no escape. It affected the church-like cults of Syria, Egypt and Persia and the semi-philosophical religions like Hermeticism and Gnosticism.[2]

Astrology, allied with magic, was from its nature a highly specialized art. It was essentially an aristocratic faith-science,[3] but eventually appealed to the populace.[4]

The practice of this religion necessitated diligent contemplation of the heavenly bodies. It was also the "foster-mother of that regnant element Mysticism." Astrology drew men from Western religions by "antiquating Greek and Roman methods of enquiry into the future."[5]

Two "baneful results" were attributed to astrology.[6] First, it was a religion of fatalism. It made Fate a terrible crushing power. Secondly, it allied itself with the practice of magic, "a curse from which the non-Christian religions of the Greek and Roman world never entirely escaped."

The decay of belief in the ancient gods, and the need to worship something real, brought Rome to worship the visible power embodied in the emperor. It was not new to worship men, either in Rome itself or in the provinces of Greece.[7] Therefore, this universal attitude helped to make the idea of

---

[1] Franz Comont, The Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism, (The Open Court Publishing Co., Chicago, 1911), p. 174.
[2] Angus, op. cit., (MR), p. 165.
[3] Cumont, op. cit., p. 165.
[4] Dill, op. cit., p. 447.
[5] Angus, op. cit., (MR), pp. 166-7.
[6] Angus, op. cit., (MR), p. 169; and Cumont, op. cit., p. 178.
[7] Hastings, op. cit., p. 52; "In Greek story men were raised to divine rank, or raised themselves to it, as the reward of work well done, and of heroic tasks completed at the cost of labor and of life."

divinity of the Emperor an acceptable thing.

Augustus' appearance was the beginning of it all. The disaster of the past had told on the moral fiber of the people.[1] The state religion of Rome had an indifferent following,[2] yet Augustus made an attempt to restore religion by means of civil power.[3]

Temples were restored or rebuilt.[4] This was the external sign of the attempt to restore religion. Augustus acted as the guiding spirit of the councils,[5] and in doing so raised a shrine to Isis,[6] and burnt two thousand books of spurious augury.[7]

---

[1] B. O. Foster, Livy, (ssii, 57), vol. 5, (Wm. Heinemann, London, 1929), p. 385f; and Fowler, op. cit., (RE), pp. 320-1; tells of a rite in which a Greek man and woman, and a Gallic man and woman (slaves, no doubt) were buried alive in the "forum boarium," in a hold closed by a big stone; and de Pressense, op. cit., (AW), p. 419; reminds us that "the salient feature of this very remarkable period is the contrast between a brilliant state of civilization, and an ever-deepening deterioration of political, moral, social and family life. . .On the one hand, in the religious sphere, an ever-growing skepticism; on the other, a craving so strong and universal to believe something, that any alien religion, any base superstition, could find a following."

[2] Mommsen, op. cit., (vol iv, Book V, chapter 12), p. 559; "The State religion of Rome was on all sides recognised as an institution of political convenience, and in this aspect was indeed indispensable, because it was just as impossible to construct the State religion adapted to form a substitute for the old, but public opinion maintained an attitude essentially indifferent to it."

[3] de Pressense, op. cit., pp. 421-2; "This was the leading idea of his policy, from the time that his authority was once firmly established;" and Kellett, op. cit., p. 110.

[4] Kellett, op. cit., p. 110; the victory of Actium meant a temple to Apollo would overlook the battle; and "as the famous inscription of Angora records, he built or rebuilt temples to Apollo on the Palatine, to Jupiter Tonaus, to Quirinus, to the Lares and Penates, and to many others - Virgil tells us three hundred;" and Cary and Haarhoff, op. cit., p. 320; says Augustus was an innovator, as well as a restorer. "In 17 BC he revived an old centenary festival, the Ludi Seculares, but in so doing he transferred the place of honor in it to Apollo;" and Dill, op. cit., pp. 533-4.

[5] E. Cary, Roman History (Dio Cassius, lii, 36), (William Heinemann, London); τὸ μὲν θεῖον πάντη πάντως αὐτός τε σέβου καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους τιμᾶν ἀνάγκαζε.

[6] Ibid., (xlvii, 15).

[7] Rolfe, op. cit., (Suetonius, vol. 1), p. 171.

It has been said that Rome had "gained the world and lost her own."[1] Polybius had said that side by side with all this, learned men from Greece found their way to Rome.[2] Everything came at once to a country unprepared.[3]

The imperial period initiated a dawn of a new era, economically, politically and religiously. Even the 'Pax Romana' was of religious character.[4]

Although private opinion differed as to matters of faith,[5] the State religion was supported by the emperors following Augustus, externally.[6] The Emperors were hailed as Saviors, "sons of the Divine, Protectors of the human race."[7]

But internal restoration was more difficult.[8] "As Pontifex Maximus

---

[1] Fowler, op. cit., p. 331.

[2] Evelyn Shuckburgh, The Histories of Polybius, (The MacMillan Co., London, 1889), vol. 2, p. 454.

[3] Glover, op. cit., (PR), p. 281; "Foreign religion, empire, the wealth of a great Macedonian kingdom, and Greek ideas."

[4] Angus, op. cit., (MR), p. 36; "The Pax Romana, the first settled peace since the days of Alexander's conquest, called forth a chorus of profound thanksgiving, which in that age was necessarily of a religious character."

[5] Dill, op. cit., p. 535; "Men like the elder Pliny and Seneca scoffed at anthropomorphic religion. Men like Juvenal and Tacitus maintained a wavering attitude, with probably a receding faith. Others like Suetonius were rapacious collectors of every scrap of the miraculous."

[6] Dill, op. cit., pp. 535f; "The emperors who succeeded Augustus were, with the exception of Nero, loyal supporters and protectors of the religion of the State ... the emperors from Augustus found religion a potent ally of sovereignty, and the example of the master of the world was a great force. Yet it may well be doubted whether, in the matter of religious conservatism, the emperors were not rather following than leading public opinion."

[7] Murray, op. cit., (SCH), p. 27; says it was impossible for anything else to happen - they were accustomed to such ideas; and Angus, op. cit., (MR), p. 36; and Kellett, op. cit., p. 112; and Tiele, op. cit., p. 246; and de Pressense, op. cit., (AW), p. 422; and Angus, op. cit., (RQ), p. 26.

[8] Hopkins, op. cit., p. 546; Augustus wanted to bring back a people, "long harassed by internal dissensions, to quiet stability."

he (Augustus) could reform ritual; as 'censor morum' he tried to reform manners and character."[1] But little was in fact accomplished.

Suetonius said that Augustus' place of birth was made sacred,[2] although Augustus himself was unwilling to accept it. And Tacitus says that Tiberius refused the petition of ambassadors from Spain, to build a temple in his name.[3] But these refusals lasted for only a short while.

Augustus finally permitted temples and altars in his name.[4] After his death, his worship was introduced in Italy. Even Suetonius felt the name 'Augustus' had 'great' significance, a higher dignity.[5] After Augustus' death, eleven cities competed for the honor of building a temple in his name.[6] Domitian, said Suetonius, issued his rescripts and formally claimed Divine power under the formula "Dominus et Deusnoster."[7]

Caesar-Worship (or Emperor-Worship) ceased to appear in control as a religious force. "But it still continued to fulfil its purpose as an official religion, and as a test of loyalty of the citizen."[8] But its social power remained long after its energy as a religion.

---

[1]Kellett, op. cit., p. 11; "Several attempts were made to encourage marriage and diminish licentiousness; several others, in good old Roman fashion, to diminish external shows of wealth and luxury, by 'sumptuary laws' - which always fail;" and Angus, op. cit., (MR), p. 37; tells us that in 13 BC, Augustus took the title of Pontifex Maximus, which gave to his person a halo of sanctity and proved so effective that subsequent emperors, pagan and Christian, retained it. In 17 BC, on his initiative, the magnificent 'ludi saeculare,' for which Horace wrote the 'Carmen Saeculare,' were celebrated with impressive solemnity;" and Hopkins, op. cit., p. 546; yet, Tiele, op. cit., p. 246; says that Augustus could only change the outward institutions - "he could breathe no life into its dead forms."

[2]Rolfe, op. cit., (Suet., The Deified Aug., 5), vol. 1, p. 129.

[3]Church and Brodribb, op. cit., (Tac. An. iv, 37, 38), p. 130.

[4]Church and Brodribb, op. cit., (Tac. An. iv. 36), pp. 129-30.

[5]Rolfe, op. cit., (Suet., The Deified Aug., 7), vol. 1, p. 131.

[6]Church and Brodribb, op. cit., (Tac., An. iv, 55), pp. 139-40.

[7]Rolfe, op. cit., (Suet., Dom., 13), vol. 2, p. 367.

[8]Hastings, op. cit., vol. 3 p. 36.

Basically, the Graeco-Roman world was "in a religious sense, destitute, both of a real sense of duty to his fellow-man of all grades, and in regard to God."[1] They were ready to try a fresh form of religion.[2]

Seneca expressed the sentiment of the day when he said: "Men love and hate their vices at the same time."[3] The people were helpless. Men were "hardened to stone."[4]

Whether the influence was social, moral, religious or philosophical, the individual was directly or indirectly moved. His environmental predicament decided so much for him.

Socially he had responsibilities that moulded his moral and ethical responses. As a religious person he had a choice, which often proved overwhelming Philosophically, he was moved by great minds and thinkers of his time. The Graeco-Roman period was a melting pot of many ideas and ethical standards, all trying to motivate the man and to touch his emotional system.

Everlasting interest, and ceaseless inquiry characterised the Greek. Beauty was sought, the idea of the charis cherished.[5] Even Plato said beauty was from childhood, and must begin with the things a child played with.[6]

---

[1] Fowler, op. cit., (RE), p. 453.

[2] de Pressense, op. cit., (AW), p. 437; Any one who brought anything new was welcome; every religious charlatan found ready dupes; and Tiele, op. cit., p. 248; "Fresh elements, therefore, were constantly being added to those which had already coalesced from Greece and Rome, and the whole mass continued to seethe and ferment."

[3] Gummere, op. cit., (Seneca, Epistulae Morales, cxxii, 4), vol. 3, p. 281.

[4] Matheson, op. cit., (Epictetus, Diss., IV, i), p. 57.

[5] Glover, op. cit., (NT), p. 25; reminds us that the idea of the charis was not reserved only for the temple; "the Greek sought it and achieved it in the common things of life; in shape, color, proportion and design he made his common vessels and implements beautiful, feeling, if he did not always talk about it, the essential relation between truth and beauty, discovered in common life;" and C. F. Smith, Thucydides, (William Heinemann, London), vol. 1, ii, 40; "φιλοκαλοῦμέν μετ εὐτελείας;" and Angus, op.cit., (E), p. 165.

[6] Shorey, op. cit., (Plato, viii, 558), vol. 2, pp. 290-1.

But the classic characteristic of the Greek was his independence. He was an individual. As Aristotle said of the Greek about happiness; it is the "end at which all actions aim" and is found to be something final and self-sufficient. Independence and self-sufficiency were strongly desired.[1]

The resultant Greek man of the first century AD, was the "spectator of all time and all existence."[2]

Longinus said of the Greek:

> "... that Nature has appointed us men to be no base or ignoble animals; but when she ushers us into life and into the vast universe as into some great assembly, to be as it were spectators of the mighty whole and the keenest aspirants for honor, forthwith she implants in our souls the unconquerable love of whatever is elevated and more divine than we."[3]

He was a curious, wondering, inquiring, discovering human being,[4] who reflected on things.

> "Everything must be examined; all the world is the proper study of man; there is no question which it is wrong for man to ask; Nature in the long run must stand and deliver; God too must explain Himself, for did He not make man so?"[5]

---

[1] H. Rackham, Aristotle, (The Nic. Ethics, I, vii), (William Heinemann, London, 1936), p. 31.

[2] Shorey, op. cit., (Plato, Rep., vi, 486).

[3] W. R. Roberts, Longinus on the Sublime, (Cambridge at the Un. Press, 1907), pp. 133-4.

[4] Angus, op. cit., (E), p. 168.

[5] Glover, op. cit., (NT), pp. 35-7; says "As Socrates said, he finds the unexamined life unliveable; he must relate everything to the real, to principle, to nature."

What was curious to the Greek, was not to the Roman.[1] Political theory, philosophy, even at first the arts were not his interests. To the Roman, a sewage system was more important than an edifice, roads greater than what one surmised from the stars.

Strabo said that doing rather than curiosity was the Roman interest.[2] Politically, he was strong, because from childhood, he was trained to respect law.[3] The Roman was a strong patriot (of his country.) Omit.

Religiously, he was primitive; intellectually (apart from law) he was unimaginative.[4] Their common law was a koinos nomos.[5] Newer outlooks, humane laws created stability. This all pointed a unified way to a new freedom.[6]

Standing in the political and philosophical background was the Jew.

> "Though oppressed by a sense of their inherent weakness and sinfulness, no people ever had a grander conception of their high calling and purpose in history; they were possessed of a proud self consciousness which raised them above all their conquerors. They believed that in them all the nations of the earth should be blessed."[7]

He had no genius for art, politics or speculation. He was dominated by the religion, that made them restless to have communion with God. He met the

---

[1] J. E. King, Cicero, (Tusc. Dis.), (William Heinemann, London, 1928), p. 147; cites Ennius as saying a genuine Roman sentiment: "phisophari sibe ait necesse esse, sed paucis; nam omnino haud placere."

[2] H. L. Jones, The Geography of Strabo, vol. 2, (C. 166), (William Heinemann, London, 1923), p. 117.

[3] Glover, op. cit., (NT), p. 73; quotes Cicero as saying that as a boy at school, he learned the XII Tables by heart, whereas a Greek boy learned the Iliad and Odyssey. Young men were steeped in legal principles, "trained to think, not in Greek plays, not in books, not in philsophy, but in law."

[4] Glover, op. cit., (NT), p. 78.

[5] E. V. Arnold, Roman Stoicism, (Cambridge at the Un. Press, 1911), pp. 384f.

[6] Lecky, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 311f; quotes lawyers on Nature, equality and freedom.

[7] Angus, op. cit., (E), pp. 140-1.

distance of the world with a sense of pride of a superior race.[1]

He could settle anywhere and still remain a Jew.[2] He did not like Gentilism, and his conflict grew worse each day.[3] But he had pride and a vision that God would produce, and save his nation. This hope kept him alive. Hope was the keynote of Hebrew character. The Jew had a conscience more sensitive than that of any other ancient people. Jewish character was marked by its "impressive solitariness."[4] Judaism, after 70 AD, became a religion without a homeland. They remained basically oriented toward life in the dispersion, despite the tradition of nationalism. They were compelled to come to terms with the government and with Christianity.[5] Yet, they had hope, which was the keynote of their ethically stable character.

This comfortable hope was nurtured upon two illusions. The first was based on an "exaggerated idea of glories of Israel at the time of King David."[6] The second illusion had its connection with the Maccabean revolt against the Seleucid monarchs. This was felt to be a brilliant triumph and gave restoration to Israel.[7] Even though in both cases the reality was far more modest than they imagined, it gave permanent and effective encouragement to the people.

---

[1] Angus, op. cit., (E), pp. 140-1.

[2] Uhlhorn, op. cit., p. 81; "The Jew settled as a citizen in all regions, knew how everywhere to make a place for himself, and yet everywhere remained a Jew."

[3] Fisher, op. cit., pp. 227-8.

[4] Angus, op. cit., (E), p. 141.

[5] Bo Reicke, The New Testament Era, trans. by D. E. Green, (Adam and Charles Black, London, 1968), p. 284.

[6] Guignebert, op. cit., p. 253; "The restoration of his reign was thus tantamount, in popular thought, to the realization of the most glowing dream of the future."

[7] Guignebert, op. cit., p. 253; felt this to be a special favor of Jahweh.

Midst all of the moral and social laxities of the first century stood the Jew, rather strong and morally righteous. As the ancient world found itself disgusted with its many gods and its immorality, it was drawn to Judaism. The first thing that attracted man was the Jewish monotheism. To the multitudes in quest of religious refuge, Judaism seemed to offer a home. In a world craving spiritual power, the Jewish faith attracted folk.[1] They were adamant on the question of monotheism, and gave attention to the education of all.[2]

Secondly, the world craved from moral reformation. Judaism had the purity of a sacred ethic, for which many hungered. By their austere and virile morality, they gained pre-eminence among the laxer morals of paganism. They had followers because of their assurance of moral self-control and moral progress.[3] They were a revealed religion that demanded obedience.[4] "The strength of Judaism rested on its ethical and spiritual content."[5]

Therefore, many people (including the Gentiles) frequented the synagogues. Although most of them did not go the limit with circumcision or the Law. The result left the Jew in the curious position of being hated and admired.

* Insert

It was in the background of this environment of the Graeco-Roman world that the Pastorals emerge. They were written to people faced with the need for stability in their belief. Christianity brought this possibility to the pagan society. The Pastorals offer a Christian ethic for this period of history.

---

[1] Angus, op. cit., (MR), p. 49.
[2] G. F. Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era, vol. 1, (Cambridge, 1927), p. 308f.
[3] Angus, op. cit., (MR), p. 51f.
[4] Moore, op. cit., (JFC), p. 324.
[5] La Piana, op. cit., XX, 4, p. 384.

The ethical teaching of the Pastorals is a moralised version of Paulinism. It is not that Paul was not very deeply concerned about the moral aspect of the churches, but that he emphasized the theological and Christocentric standard of these demands. The Pastorals do not always do this.[1] The Pastoral ethic is in many respects not that of Paul.

Paul's ethic springs from the Spirit, the ethic of the Pastorals is the natural product of a religious life. In the Pastorals, it is something man does because of what he himself is; whereas, Paul would say, "whatever is not of faith is sin."[2] Life, for Paul, meant life in relation to God.[3]

The author of the Pastorals does not rely on the Spirit, as Paul does. Morality is something by itself. Such ethical virtues and duties which do appear, seem to exist in their own right, and are thus ends complete in themselves.[4]

The aim is to recall the standard of the past and adjust it to the environment of the present, without changing the central message. But the author's method is different from that of Paul.

There seems to be a feeling of restraint. The arranging of one's life vacillates between the Christian way and the way of custom.[5]

Everyone was touched by the Hellenistic influence of the period. How far we are indebted to Stoicism for the ethic of the post-apostolic period cannot

---

[1] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. xxxii; "The Pastoral Epistles are different from the undoubted Pauline writings of Paul, not because their interest is chiefly ethical, but because they teach an ethic which, in some respects, is not that of Paul."

[2] Rom. 14:23.

[3] A. B. D. Alexander, The Ethics of St. Paul, (James Maclehose and Sons, Glasgow, 1910); "God was to him the beginning and end of existence."

[4] Barrett, op. cit, (C), p. 26; "To recognise this, however, is not to deny that truly Christian motives do underlie the ethical teaching of the Pastorals, though it must be admitted that these are sometimes far from evident."

[5] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. xxxii; "He takes account not only of what is Christian but of what is seemly, prudent, useful, agreeable to settled custom."

be weighed. There are remarkable affinities between Stoicism and Pauline ethics.[1] This is evident in the Pastorals, because the author is at heart a Paulinist.

The Pastorals say that man is to be strong in the grace that is in Christ Jesus (2 Tim. 2:1), endure hardness as a good soldier would (2 Tim. 2:3), strive for masteries (2 Tim. 2:5), and labor as a husbandman in the fields (2 Tim. 2:6). The reputation of the church is in the hands of the individual Christian (1 Tim. 3:7, 6:1). This is expressed by listing the demands on various classes of individuals (Tit. 2:5, 3:8).

The ethical character of the Christian life in the Pastorals is described by the word eusebeia. This becomes the correct attitude of the Christian. The character of this life is expressed positively,[2] as well as negatively.[3] What is against sound teaching becomes a vice to ward against; it is unlawful. The law is not made for the lawful, but for the lawless and undisciplined.

Eusebeia is one of the ruling terms in the Pastorals. It expresses a fundamental idea of reverence and awe in religion. It is closely allied in meaning with the Latin word pietas.[4] The Greek word has the same double meaning as the Latin word. Eusebeia means by its very derivation, piety toward

---

[1] Alexander, op. cit., (EP), p. 45; "That there are remarkable affinities between Stoicism and Pauline ethics has been frequently pointed out, and the similarity both in language and sentiment can scarcely be accounted for by mere coincidence."

[2] Positive expressions: temperate, soberminded, orderly, gentle, blameless, just, holy, self-controlled, grave, patience, meekness, pure, good.

[3] Negative expressions: no brawler, no striker, not contentious, no lover of money, not puffed up, not self-willed, not soon angry, not greedy of filthy lucre, not doubled-tongued, not a slanderer.

[4] Trench, op. cit., p. 172; notes the fact that ἀσεβής and εὐσεβής have a double meaning. "It has in fact the same double meaning as the Latin pietas, which is not merely justitia adversum Deos, or scientia colendorum deorum (Cicero, Nat. Deor. i, 41); but a double meaning, which deeply instructive as it is, yet proves occasionally embarrassing; so that on several occasions Augustine, when he has need of accuracy and precision in his language, pauses to observe that by pietas he means

* add to footnote #4: H. Rackham, Cicero, De Natura Deorum, William Heineman, London, 1947, pp 111-113; and JEC Weldon, St. Augustine, De Civitate Dei, vol 1, Society of Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1924, p. 402 f.

God, or towards the gods, but it also has another side. Eusebeia also means piety in the fulfilment of human relations.[1] In Sophocles, reverence for the gods is man's highest duty,[2] but eusebeia is also expressed in its outward acts of service.[3]

The Greek ideal of a religious man was seen in Socrates and is summed up in the word eusebeia:

> "So religious that he did nothing without counsel from the gods; so just that he did no injury, however small to any man, but conferred the greatest benefits on all who dealt with him; so self-controlled that he never chose the pleasanter rather than the better course; so wise that he was unerring in his judgement of the better and the worse, and needed no counselor, but relied on himself for his knowledge of them; no less masterly in putting others to the test, and convincing them of error and exhorting them to follow virtue and gentleness."[4]

Even the Stoic taught that godliness was essentially of the spirit, "but they did not as a rule, refuse to observe the outward service to the gods as commonly practiced."[5] Godliness was used also of the loyalty to the emperor.[6] In classical Greek there is no word which covers religion as the

---

what εὐσέβεια may mean, but θεοσέβεια alone must mean, namely 'piety toward God (Dei pietatem, quam Graeci vel εὐσέβειαν, vel expressius et plenius θεοσέβειαν, vocant, Ep. clxvii. 3; De Trin. xiv. I; Civ. Dei, x. I; Enclsir. I); and Falconer, op. cit., p. 31; "In Latin pietas approximates closely to εὐσέβεια, closer that religio; and Fowler, op. cit., (RE), p. 416; and Cyril Bailey, Religion in Virgil, (Oxford, 1935), p. 30; says "Religio the feeling of awe, pietas the spirit of devotion;" and William Barclay, More New Testament Words, (SCM Press, London, 1958), p. 68; "Pietas was the spirit of devotion to goodness, to honor, to honesty, to duty."

---

[1] Trench, op. cit., p. 172; as towards parents or others (Euripides, Elect. 253, 4).
[2] F. Storr, Sophocles, (Phil. 1441), vol. 2, (William Heinemann, London, 1913), p. 491.
[3] Ibid., (Antig. 731), p. 371.
[4] E. C. Marchant, Xenophon, (Mem. iv., 8), (William Heinemann, London, 1923), p. 359.
[5] Falconer, op. cit., p. 31.
[6] Moulton, and Milligan, op. cit., p. 265.

term is used today. Eusebeia comes nearest to it.[1]

In the LXX eusebeia refers only to the duty which man owes to God.[2] It is in the LXX that eusebeia, or derivatives of it, occur many times.[3] In 4 Maccabees, one of the fundamental notes of the book is 'pious reason.'[4]

Oddly enough, a word such as eusebeia and its cognates, which is used so much elsewhere, is seldom mentioned in the rest of the New Testament.[5] The fundamental idea of the word is found in Acts. It is based upon reverence for, and worship of God. This is similar to the Hellenistic attitude.

In the Pastorals it is godliness that provides the outward expression of the faith. Piety, or godliness, is even more dominant than the word faith, which dominates Paul's original letters. The idea of godliness as a mystery is seen in 1 Timothy 3:16.[6] This passage parallels godliness with religion. As most Hellenistic religions had their mystery, so has the Christian faith.[7] One is to hold this mystery in a pure, or clean, conscience, and with godliness.[8] This mystery of piety becomes a revealed secret in Jesus Christ.[9] He is the example of godliness. Eusebeia becomes the true reverence for God which comes from knowledge of him.

---

[1] A. D. Nock, Conversion, (Oxford at the Un. Press, 1933), p. 10; "Classical Greek has no word which covers religion as we use the term eusebeia approximates to it, but in essence means no more than the regular performance of due worship in the proper spirit, while hosiotes describes ritual purity. The place of faith was taken by myth and ritual. These things implied an attitude rather than a conviction."

[2] Arndt and Gindrich, op. cit., p. 326.

[3] Falconer, op. cit., p. 32; The words are seldom found in Wisdom, Sirach, 2 and 3 Maccabees; but in 4 Maccabees they are found quite often.

[4] 4 Macc. vii, 18-19; "Those who with their whole heart give heed to piety, alone are able to overcome the passions of the flesh..."

[5] Falconer, op. cit., p. 34f; gives a list of usages.

[6] 1 Tim. 3:16; "Great indeed we confess, is the mystery of our religion..."

[7] Kittel, op. cit., p. 40; and H. H. Scullard, The Ethics of the Gospel, (Student Christian Movement, London, 1927), pp. 48-9; and Helmut Thielicke, The Ethics of Sex, (James Clark and Co., London, 1964), p. 126.

[8] C. E. Luthhardt, History of Christian Ethics, trans. by W. Hastie, (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1889), p. 100.

[9] Simpson, op. cit., p. 60; suggests this represents the true religion. "Musterion in the singular means secret, from Plato (Theaet. 156) downwards to Menander (Fr. 695), the Apocrypha and Vettius Valeus (pp. 48, 72); in the New Testament, 'a revealed secret.'"

Godliness and sound teaching are intimately connected.[1] It is the words of Christ which provide sound doctrine, and if anyone's teaching is contrary to them, that teaching is not in accordance with godliness and that man is conceited, ignorant and morbidly fond of controversy (1 Tim. 6:3-5).

A man should train himself in godliness. If a man takes bodily exercise, how much more should he exercise his soul and his whole life in godliness (1 Tim. 4:7), for godliness is valuable both for this life, and the life to come. The aim of the writer of the Pastorals is to awaken faith and to pass on that knowledge which is in accordance with godliness (Tit. 1:1).

Godliness must be the mark of the life that every Christian must live (1 Tim. 4:7-8, 6:11). A Christian is to exercise himself unto godliness. The Christian is to train himself in godliness. He is to follow after godliness, which to this author is closely connected with righteousness, faith, love, patience, and meekness. Godliness becomes the aim of all the activities of the Christian.

The idea of exercising oneself in godliness reminds us that the training is our own. We become our own trainer.[2] The training must be the training of the whole self for living a religious life. The idea of training is also emphasized in 2 Timothy 2:5, in the picture of the athlete. The athlete is only crowned if he competes according to the rules. Unless the Christian exercises himself in godliness he fails God. To train oneself in godliness is the opposite of concerning oneself with godless and silly myths (1 Tim. 4:7). Godliness can only be attained through genuine Christian self-discipline which Timothy and all Christians must practice.[3]

---

[1] 1 Tim. 6:3; "If anyone teaches otherwise and does not agree with the sound words of our Lord Jesus Christ and the teaching which accords with godliness."

[2] Lock, op. cit., p. 51; "Perhaps with the thought 'in my absence' (so Bengal) is implied."

[3] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 99; "It consists however, not in unnatural forms of abstinence, but, we may presume, in general self-control, continuous devotion to the gospel tradition, and perhaps most of all (as 4:10 suggests), accepting cheerfully the cross of suffering which all Christians must expect."

Godliness is also the mark of the Christian leader (1 Tim. 6:3; Tit. 1:1). As has been previously stated, sound doctrine is teaching in accord with the words of our Lord Jesus Christ. To his teaching Christian piety will conform. Therefore, it is says in the Pastorals that the false teacher makes only a pretence of piety (2 Tim. 3:5), and the mark of the Christian leader must be the man of genuineness. A life of leadership and godliness go hand in hand, just as do godliness and sound doctrine.

Godliness is the virtue of Christian leadership;[1] but there are those whose religion is no more than an outward form. Such people are religious in appearance, but they deny the power of religion (2 Tim. 3:5). This type of piety is to be avoided for it will never produce genuine virtue. This form of piety causes degeneration in the church, because it is concerned not with divine power but with human show.

The true teacher follows after godliness, faith, love, righteousness, patience, and meekness.[2] In 1 Timothy 6:11 eusebeia describes the teacher's character, in which righteousness is the dominant characteristic. This characteristic is one of reverent loyalty, obedience and worship towards God.[3] These are the true aims to be kept before the Christian leader in his teaching.[4] These are virtues that stand strong in contrast to dzētēseis and logomachiai.

---

[1] 1 Tim. 6:11; "But as for you, man of God, shun all this; aim at righteousness, godliness, faith, love, steadfastness, gentleness." 2 Tim. 3:5; "... holding the form of religion but denying the power of it..." Tit. 2:12; "... training us to renounce irreligion and worldly passions, and to live sober, upright, and godly lives in this world."

[2] 1 Tim. 6:11.

[3] Parry, op. cit., p. 40.

[4] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 76; notes that Paul would have used faith, and love to include everything - yet here they are regarded as specific virtues which now need to be combined with others.

To renounce irreligion and worldly passions and to live a sober, upright and godly life, is the way to the virtuous Christian life (Tit. 3:12). This is the mark of Christian leadership. The Christian life has become a life of discipline and training.[1] The people in the Pastorals are not liberated, as in Paul, but trained to renounce these godless ways and worldly desires.[2] The life of temperance, honesty and godliness is characteristic of the Christian ideal, and a mark of Christian leadership.

The strength of eusebeia is in its mission. The prayer of the Christian is that life may be so ordered that it will be possible for him to live a godly life.[3] The godly life is also a life which befits a woman who adorns herself in good deeds.[4] And Christian piety is demonstrated in the home as mission to the family.[5]

The sense of outreach is evident in eusebeia. Not only is there a call to respect God, but also a call to respect all human superiors.[6] Christian piety has a social ethic attached to it, an ethic which is the expression of godliness. The government's service is a service to the Christian, which in turn allows him to lead a godly peaceful life (1 Tim. 2:2).[7]

---

[1] Refer to 2 Tim. 2:25; 3:16.

[2] Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 137.

[3] 1 Tim. 2:1-2; "First of all then, I urge that supplications, prayers, intercessions, and thanksgivings be made for all men, for kings and all who are in high positions, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life, godly and respectable in every way."

[4] 1 Tim. 2:10.

[5] 1 Tim. 5:14; "If a widow has children or grandchildren, let them first learn their religious duty to their own family and make some return to their parents."

[6] Lock, op. cit., p. 58; notes that this is rarely applied to human beings, but does occur; and Luthardt, op. cit., p. 101; it is recognition and obedience to the earthly orders too, which includes the political.

[8] D. Bonhoeffer, Ethics, (SCM Press, London, 1955), p. 310; says "through its service towards Christ, government is intimately linked with the church. If it fulfills its mission as it should the congregation can live in peace, for government and congregation serve the same Master."

Good deeds, prayer, piety at home and suffering are expressions of godliness. Therefore, godliness becomes man's relation to God in a godly manner. Fellowship with Christ in suffering is part and parcel of the Christian's mystical union with him.[1]

Godliness can be distorted. The author of the Pastorals says some people try to make that godliness a means of gain (1 Tim. 6:5). These people hold the form of religion, or godliness, but deny the power thereof (2 Tim. 3:5).

True godliness keeps a man away from the love of false wealth and gain. There is a sense in which religion is a means of gain (1 Tim. 4:8).[2] Religion becomes gain when it means hope in God (1 Tim. 5:10). It is also gain when it arises out of God's saving power. But religion is not gain when man tries to win salvation by his own piety (1 Tim. 1:15; 2 Tim. 1:9; Tit. 3:4f). Godliness (or religion) is distorted if it is regarded as only a means of gain.

The godly way is very distorted if a person's habits and life are shaped on religion, but lack the power of it. The idea of religion expressed in 2 Timothy 3:5, is one that is not supposed to function. It is not simply a matter of organized religion that has ceased to function, but a religion that is not intended to function.[3]

True godliness will keep the man of God from the love of riches which is where the false teacher fails. The Christian finds happiness and wealth in his piety. 1 Timothy 6:6 says that there is great gain in godliness with contentment. The meaning of this passage is a life of piety that is lived by anyone who has enough, is wealth indeed.[4] When godliness is used with the term contentment, there is a religious motive. By living a pious life, one has contentment.

---

[1]Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 200.
[2]Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 84.
[3]Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 158.
[4]Kittel, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 466f.

Contentment means independence of outward circumstances. The pious Christian is self-sufficient (in a positive sense). In Philippians 4:11, Paul said: "for I have learned in whatever state I am, to be content." The same meaning is here in the Pastorals. This is not a lazy contentment, but contentment found in a godly way of life. Therefore, it is right to say that godliness is profitable.[1] It is not profitable as gain if it is destitute of the truth, but only if contentment is with godliness. This is contentment found in sound doctrine, not bodily exercise (1 Tim. 6:5-6). One cannot substitute bodily exercise for spiritual culture, which alone possesses moral or spiritual meaning.[2]

The strength behind a life that is godly is Christ himself. Godliness is embodied in Christ. Christian godliness is based on a mystery of universal appeal and imperishable hope.[3] The saving revelation which lies behind the Christian faith and finds expression in the Christian life, is embodied in Jesus Christ. Therefore, godliness is embodied in Christ.

In 1 Timothy 3:16, godliness has a special meaning since the writer was thinking of the practical rules he had just laid down in the previous verses.[4] Godliness becomes inclusive of both the faith and the practice of the Christian life, and it is embodied in Christ.

Therefore, the idea of godliness has mystery in its origin. It has a sense of sound healthy doctrine as its foundation, and expresses virtue as its mission to the world. The ethical peak of the Pastorals is centered in the word godliness.

---

[1] As it was in 1 Timothy 4:7-8.
[2] J. C. Murray, A Handbook of Christian Ethics, (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1908), p. 70.
[3] Falconer, op. cit., p. 138.
[4] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 40.

Another prominent ethical term in the Pastorals is sophron (and cognates). To be a thoughtful, self-controlled, prudent, soberminded person is the aim for each Christian in the Pastorals. The man who possesses such qualities succeeds in being in the world, but not of the world.

The background of the word sophron shows the depth of its meaning. It shows why the author of these epistles gave so much attention to the term and its derivatives. Plato defined sophron as self-discipline in certain desires and pleasures, particularly in connection with women.[1] Plato used it with modesty, as constituting the truest adornment of womanhood.[2] Sophron is also used over against other words. Xenophon said it was the opposite of madness.[3] Aristotle set soberminded ness over against licentiousness.[4]

Aristotle also defined sophron as describing a virtue "which disposes men in regard to the pleasure of the body as the law prescribes."[5] It also describes the observance of the mean,[6] when dealing with pains and pleasures of the body.[7] Aristotle derived sophron (σως-φρην) or sound-minded from sodzein and phronasis. A man with this quality preserves prudence. For temperance does in fact "preserve our belief as to our own good."[8] Sophron describes a virtue of the irrational part of the soul.[9]

---

[1] Shorey, op. cit., (Plato, Rep. 4), p. 357f.
[2] H. N. Fowler, Plato (Phaedrus, 253d), (William Heinemann, London, 1914), p. 495.
[3] Marchant, op. cit., (Xen., Mem., I, 1, 16), p. 11.
[4] J. H. Freese, Aristotle (Rhet. 1, 9), (William Heinemann, London, 1947), p. 91f.
[5] Freese, op. cit., (Rhet.), p. 93; he says contrary to self-control is licentiousness.
[6] Rackham, op. cit., (Nic. Eth.), p. 99; "In respect of pleasures and pains - not all of them, and to a less degree in respect of pains - the observance of the mean is Temperance, the excess Profligacy."
[7] Rackham, op. cit., (Nic. Eth.), p. 175; and yet he even differentiates these also, "but not with all even of these ..."
[8] Rackham, op. cit., (Nic. Eth.), p. 339.
[9] Rackham, op. cit. (Nic. Eth.), p. 173; speaks of Courage and Temperance as virtues of the irrational parts of the soul.

Maccabees used the word sophron and its cognates often to describe a cardinal virtue.[1] Josephus used it to define the character of a woman.[2] He also spoke of sober guidance of the law.[3] Philo said sophrosunē is the mean between asotia and pheidolia .[4] Philo, like Aristotle, set it over against akolasia .[5]

The Imperial period had many epitaphs which paid tribute to women who were soberminded. The collocation, "loving to her husband and soberminded," was not rare. This phrase occurred in epitaphs for women of this period at Termessus in Pisidia, Prusicia on the Hypius in Bythnia, and Heraclia on the Black Sea.[6]

Sophron and its cognates are especially characteristic of the Pastoral Epistles. In these epistles, it is the free and willing self-control which no longer requires effort. The main stress is on the judgement, which recognises the true relation between body and spirit.[7] Sophron describes a rational self-control.

Gilbert Murray says this about sophrosunē:[8]

> "It is something like temperance, gentleness, mercy; sometimes innocence, never merely caution; a tempering of dominant emotions by gentler thought"

---

[1] To name a few: 2 Macc. 4:37; 4 Macc. 1:3, 1:6, 1:35, 2:2, 2:16, 2:18, 3:17, 3:19, 7:23, and 15:10.

[2] H. S. J. Thackeray and Ralph Marcus, Josephus, (Ant. 6:308, 18:180), (William Heinemann, London, 1934), p. 321.

[3] H. S. J. Thackeray, Josephus, (Ant. 4, 184),(William Heinemann, London, 1930), p. 565.

[4] Colson, op. cit., (De Praem et Poen. 9), vol. 7-8, p. 319.

[5] F. H. Colson, and G. H. Whitaker, Philo, (Mund. Opif. 21), vol. 1, (William Heinemann, London,1949), p. 49f.

[6] Deismann, op. cit, (LAE), p. 319.

[7] Lock, op. cit., p. 148.

[8] Gilbert Murray, The Rise of the Greek Epic, (Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1907), p. 27; yet C. A. A. Scott, Words, (Student Christian Movement Press, 1939), p. 85; disagrees with the use of the word sophron as temperance. He says that in none of the passages where this word occurs has anything to do with temperance.

Murray sees sophrosunē as a saving power and would give it an altruistic effect.[1] He says that there is a way of thinking that destroys, and a way of thinking that saves[2] - that is, there are destructive thoughts, and saving thoughts.[3] The one who is sophron "walks among the beauties and perils of the world, feeling the love, joy, anger, and the rest; and through all he has that in his mind which saves ... It saves the imminent evil from coming to be."[4]

The application of sobermindedness in these epistles is widespread. It describes every class of people: those in authority, such as bishops (1 Tim. 3:2; Tit. 1:8), Paul, Timothy and other teachers (2 Tim. 1:7); older men (Tit. 2:2); women (1 Tim. 2:9); elderly women (Tit. 2:4); young women (Tit. 2:5); and young men (Tit. 2:6). Sobermindedness is one of the essential characteristics of the Christian life. "It is properly the condition of an entire command over the passions and desires, so that they receive no further allowance than that which the law and right reason admit and approve."[5] It is easy to see why the ethic of the Pastorals stresses this virtue of the faith, even though its prominence was more in heathen ethics than in Christian.[6]

Sobermindedness is a virtue for every part of life. Whether a person is aged or young, man or woman (Tit. 2:2-6), he or she should possess this virtue. It is a virtue for every part of life because it is the virtue of the person who has control of life. A prudent man is one with a mind which has everything

---

[1] Lock, op. cit., p. 149; disagrees: "This is an excellent description of its usage; but I doubt whether it springs from the derivation, which implies a sound rather than a saving mind."

[2] Murray, op. cit., (RGE), p. 28.

[3] W. C. Helmbold, Plutarch's Moralia (De Tranquillitate Animi, 474), vol. 6, (William Heinemann, London, 1962), p. 218f.

[4] Murray, op. cit., (RGE), p. 28.

[5] Trench, op. cit., p. 70.

[6] Trench, op. cit., p. 71; "... not because more value was attached to it there than with us; but partly because there it was one of a much smaller company of virtues; each of which therefore would singly attract more attention; but also in part because for as many as are 'led by the Spirit,' this condition of self-command is taken up and transformed into a condition yet higher still."

under control.[1]

It is remarkable that in the ethical descriptions in Titus, the writer of the Pastorals uses sophron, and its cognates, to describe the character of each type of person about whom he speaks. The idea behind it is that he or she must posses the highest self-control. It also describes the sensual aspect of morality for women. They are reminded to be chaste, and control their sexual desire. The passage could refer only to the pleasures of the body, but likely not. The adjective possible denotes sober in contrast to insane.[2]

The author insists on a mode of living which is in keeping with the gospel. Therefore, as one of its virtues, sobermindedness becomes an entire command over all the passions and desires.[3] Whatever one wants, it would be unadvisable to take or choose unless sobermindedness governs the choice. No passion or desire should receive further allowance than that which the law and right reason admit and approve.[4]

Sobermindedness is definitely a virtue for every part of life. In the Pastorals a primary place is given to self-control, which ranked in Greek ethics with justice, wisdom, and courage.[5] The moral virtue now becomes a religious one in the Pastorals.

Specifically, sobermindedness is the virtue of leadership. This is the least a bishop should be.[6] He has to practice mastery of self. He is not to crush his body or physical nature, but to discipline it, control it, and bring it to its proper relation to his whole of life.

---

[1] Barclay, op. cit., (C), p. 282.
[2] Easton, op. cit., p. 233.
[3] Alexander, op. cit., (EP), p. 185; and Trench, op. cit., p. 70.
[4] Trench, op. cit., p. 70; cf. 4 Macc. 1:31; Tit. 2:12; Plato, (Symp. 196c); Aristotle (Rhet. 1:9); Plutarch (De Curios. 14; De Virt. Mor. 2; and Gryll. 6); Philo (De Immut. Dei, 35); Diogenes Laertius, iii, 57, 91; Clement of Alexandria, Strom. ii, 18.
[5] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 165.
[6] 1 Tim. 3:2f.

Every leader must possess that habitual inner self-government. He has to have a constant rein on all passions and desires. Although this virtue is demanded of all Christians, it is emphasized in the only two groups of passages about the highest leader in the community - the bishop or overseer (1 Tim. 3:2; Tit. 1:8). The bishop has to make sure that when temptation arises, he has self-control. He is to be completely temperate, in contrast to the traits condemned in the previous verse (Tit. 1:7).[1]

It is significant to note that sophron is united with egkrates. Among the Stoics the enkrateia is a subordinate to the sophrosunē .[2] The former denotes a mastery of ones own desires and impluses with a genuine deliberate effort. The latter refers more to a willing and free control which no longer requires effort.[3] Both virtues emphasize mastery of oneself, and should be virtues of every leader.

Sobermindedness is also a mark of the Christian life. This virtue was valued in secular society, but now it refers specifically to the Christian life. Both 1 Timothy 2:9, 15 and Titus 2:12, describe the Christian's dilemma. First, women have to be careful how they adorn themselves. They should be modest and sensible. And secondly, men should be careful of worldly passions. They are encouraged to live sober, upright and godly lives.

The best of conduct has to be exemplified in the Christian. Therefore, men and women alike are urged to demonstrate such conduct. Women must observe modesty and simplicity in dress and actions. Men are to turn their back on godless ways and worldly desires. Each is to live soberly. Each is to have mastery over himself and herself. It is not enough only to renounce irreligion. Life must be lived in a sober, righteous, and godly way.

---

[1] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 232.
[2] Falconer, op. cit., p. 104.
[3] Murray, op. cit., (RGE), p. 28; and Lock, op. cit., p. 148.

Possibly the triad of adverbs in Titus 2:12 expresses the Christian's ideal behavior towards himself, his neighbor, and his God.[1] This is the only time sophronos is used in the New Testament. It becomes a part of the basic virtues which summarize the threefold requirement of morality.[2] Sophrosune parallels enkrateia in which Paul's list of the fruit of the Spirit culminates.[3] But in the Pastorals sophrosune is not so much a fruit of the Spirit as it is a quality which the Christian by constant self-discipline can attain.

The use of sophronismou in 2 Timothy 1:7 is the only case of the substantive in the Pastorals.

> "For God did not give us a spirit of timidity,
> but a spirit of power and love and self-control."

It is not just a body that has been given to man to use sensibly, but also a mind to be made sound. This has a direct relation to the teaching and learning of morality or moderation. Sophron becomes a description of sober wisdom.[4] This deals directly with the capacity to influence and direct one's own life as well as the lives of our fellow-men.

Sophronismos is not a Pauline word. It is found only here in the New Testament. It occurs in Plutarch and Josephus, but not in the LXX. It is the "active control of oneself," in panic, or in the face of passion.[5] If it is Christ who gives that self-mastery, self-discipline, self-control, then sophronismos is that divinely given self-mastery which enables man to lead because he first served.[6]

Sobermindedness grows from the inside and begins with a right attitude, a seriousness.[7] It becomes that which keeps life safe. To the author of the Pastorals, mastery of self means self-control of the body, self-discipline in

---

[1] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 168.
[2] Alexander, op. cit., (EP), p. 185.
[3] Gal. 5:23.
[4] Easton, op. cit., p. 234.
[5] Falconer, op. cit., p. 76.
[6] Barclay, op. cit., (C), p. 166.
[7] Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 74.

pleasures, and sober wisdom in the use of the mind.

Three synonymous words describe in the Pastorals another necessary ethical condition. Kosmios, semnos, and hieroprepes belong to the history of a grand age in Greek language.[1] They are linked together, but each has its own individuality. They are very characteristic of the Pastorals.[2]

In Titus 2:3, hieroprepes expresses that which "becomes a sacred person, thing, or act." It is joined with sophron, being an epithet applied to women professing godliness.[3] Kosmios is also joined with sophron in 1 Timothy 2:9. Semnos and hieroprepes are more closedly connected in meaning than kosmios.[4]

Semnos is the dominating word of the three. The other two words are used to complement semnos or when there is a relationship that needs to be explained.

In secular Greek semnos was a constant epithet of the gods.[5] Also it was used to qualify things that pertained to, or were in relation with the heavenly world.[6] Aristotle used semnos and its cognates differently. He spoke of the dignity of one in power as a dignified and decent pomposity.[7] He took

---

[1] H. G. Liddel, and Robert Scott, A Greek English Lexicon, (Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1951); σεμνός (Demeter, L. Cer. I, 486, Hecate, Pi. P. 3.79; Thetis, Id. N. 5.25; Apollo, A. Th. 800; Poseidon, S. OC. 55; Arist. Rh. 1398b 26; A. Ag. 519. ; Ar. Pl. 940); κόσμιος (Arist. Rh. 1408a 14, Po. 1457b 2, 1458a 33; and Trench, op. cit., p. 345; notes it corresponds very nearly to the compositus of Seneca (Ep. 114), and to the compositus et ordinatus (De Vit., Beat. 8); ἱεροπρεπής (Plato, Theag. 122 d; Xenophon, Conv. vii, 40).

[2] σεμνός occurs only in Phil. 4:8 other than the Pastorals (Tit. 2:2, 2:7; 1 Tim. 3:8, 3:11, 2:2, 3:4), κόσμιος (1 Tim. 2:9, 3:2), and ἱεροπρεπής (Tit. 2:3, 5), occurs only in the Pastorals.

[3] Trench, op. cit., p. 349; "That such behavior will breed reverence and awe, we may reasonably expect, but this is not implied in hieroprepas as it is in semnos and here we must find the distinction between them."

[4] Trench, op. cit., p. 349.

[5] Trench, op. cit., p. 347; and Barclay, op. cit., (MNTW), p. 141.

[6] Trench, op. cit., p. 347.

[7] Freese, op. cit., (Rhet. ii, 17), p. 261f.

semnoteis to be the golden mean between areskeia and authadia.[1]

Semnos is used in the LXX when defining a state of things as honorable and worthy.[2] In Clement of Rome semnos carries an awe-inspiring and majestic tone, as well the down-to-earth description of man. Clement of Rome spoke complimentarily to the Corinthians when he said they taught the young temperate and seemly (semna) thoughts, as well as giving instruction to women, so that they would do things in a blameless and seemly way.[3] He also spoke of σεμνότης as the worthy characteristic of brotherly love.[4] Tertullian contrasted the gravitas honesta of Christians, springing from the fear of God, with the levity of heathen life.[5] Eusebius spoke of the church shining out before the eyes of the world by its gravity, its sincerity, its freedom, its self-restraint, and its purity.[6] This gravity is the attitude of men who take a serious, but not a gloomy view of life.[7]

Elsewhere in the New Testament the only occurrence of the adjective (semnos) is in Philippians 4:8.[8] This is possibly where Paul is citing from one of the better Greek moralists.[9] It is used of things rather than persons in Philippians.

---

[1] Barclay, op. cit., (MNTW), p. 144; notes that Aristotle defined virtues as a mean. He defined semnos as the mean between areskeia and authadia. Areskeia is the characteristic of the man who is so eager to please that he is like a fawning dog; authadia is the characteristic of the man who thinks so little of pleasing that he is like an ill-mannered boor. Semnos is the word which describes the man who carries himself towards other men with a combination of dignified independence and kindly consideration."

[2] 2 Macc. 8:15. Other LXX renderings are Jd. 11:35; Pr. 6:8, 8:6, 15:26; 2 Macc. 6:11, 6:25; and 4 Macc. 5:36, 7:15, 17:5.

[3] Lake, op. cit., vol.1,(Cor. 1:3), p. 11.

[4] Lake, op. cit., vol. 1, (Cor. 47:5), p. 91.

[5] Peter Holmes, The Writings of Tertullian, (Prasescr. 43), vol. 2, (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1870), p. 52.

[6] Kirsop Lake, Eusebius, (Hist. E. iv, 7), (William Heinemann, London, 1926), p. 319.

[7] Brown, op. cit., p. 15.

[8] The noun semnotes does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament.

[9] Easton, op. cit., p. 232.

Semnos carries with it the idea of seriousness. In the Pastorals it is a virtue of every person (1 Tim. 3:11; Tit. 2:2), young (Tit. 2:7), old (Tit. 2:12), male or female (1 Tim. 3:11), and leaders (1 Tim. 3:8). It describes the type of person who is truly worthy of respect, and honorable in God's sight. There is a religious dignity about the one who possesses this seriousness. The style of his life is like a great, continual religious service (Tit. 2:3). He is to carry into life what the priest carries into the Temple.[1]

This virtue was prominent in Hellenistic ethics. It is a virtue of inherent dignity of character which inspires respect. It is the outcome of a life of piety. It denotes a seriousness of purpose which particularly suits the dignity of the senior citizen. It is the essential quality of Christians in general.

Specifically, the author of the Pastorals speaks of this seriousness as a virtue of leadership (1 Tim. 3:4, 3:8; Tit. 2:7). Women are no different than their male counterparts. Women are to be seriousminded (1 Tim. 3:11). Semnos is a word denoting an "inward temper and an outward bearing," for every Christian leader.[2]

The teacher is to possess this virtue also (Tit. 2:7). The Greeks thought of their teachers as being equipped with the highest of virtues. Semnos is a Greek ideal virtue,[3] and is used to denote the proper dignity of a teacher. The indication in Titus 2:7 is that the teacher should teach in a serious manner,

---

[1]Lock, op. cit., p. 140; "... temple-like, reverent, like people entangled in sacred duties." He notes that the idea of life as one constant festival to the wise man is found in the Stoic writers (Marc. Aurel. 3:4).

[2]Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 35.

[3]Falconer, op. cit., p. 109.

but also should be of high principle.[1] His teaching is to be marked by dignity. In the non-religious contexts, semnos came to mean sublime or elevated.[2] The teacher is one who is elevated above others because of his dignity and high principles. When used in this Christian context, semnos is supported by aphthoria (integrity). In other words, for the teacher, integrity denotes a pure motive, while gravity denotes a high moral tone and a serious manner.[3] Every teacher is to be untainted,[4] and serious in his work. Every leader should have this virtue of seriousness.

Seriousness is also a virtue of discipline (1 Tim. 3:4). It gives a guideline in the family for discipline. It is the outstanding quality of a good father.[5] Semnotes is spoken of in the context of managing one's household. Therefore, the idea is not whether this is stern discipline, but whether it is dignified discipline. The suggestion of sternness should be avoided; yet the idea of natural respect should be retained,[6] because the power of control rests in the dignity of character.[7]

Lastly, the visible description of the Christian is to be serious. Semnotes is connected with another virtue, eusebeia (1 Tim. 2:2). Together, they denote the character that can be best developed in peace and quiet.

---

[1]Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 135; and A. Deismann, Biblical Studies, trans. by A. Grieve, (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1901), p. 200; notes that this means one should not be liable to censur, criticism, or to be silenced.

[2]Easton, op. cit., p. 232.

[3]Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 242.

[4]Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 195; says aphthoria is unique in biblical Greek, and denotes untaintedness in teaching as a direct contrast to false teaching.

[5]Barclay, op. cit., (NNTW), p. 140; yet, Easton, op. cit., p. 233; feels that the noun may describe either the father or the children. "In the former case dignity is a good translation, in the latter, respect."

[6]Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 82; and Scott, op. cit., (C),p. 32; suggests that this is "not a stern disciplinarian who is thought of, but a man whose character has impressed his children, so that they naturally look up to to him; and Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 78; says dignity is suggested, not violence though.

[7]Falconer, op. cit., p. 134.

One defines religious devotion while the other emphasizes the seriousness of purpose.[1] Both terms develop better in conditions of external peace. They represent the visible expression of the religious frame of mind.[2] An ordered life develops better under a peaceful government. This godly and serious life involves respect for oneself as well as for other men. Along with eusebeia which describes the religious attitude, semnotes denotes moral earnestness, "affecting outward demeanor as well as interior intention."[3] Therefore, to be godly and serious becomes a visible expression of the Christian in society. Through a wise and peaceful government, the Christian can have an ordered life (1 Tim. 2:2).

The adjectives dikaios and hosios play an important part in the ethics of the Pastorals. They are often grouped together for purposes of emphasis. Plato, Josephus and the New Testament provide examples of this.[4] Derivatives from these two words are found together also.[5] The distinction has been often urged that hosios describes "one careful of his duties toward God, and dikaios toward men." This is true in classical Greek,[6] but there is nothing that warrants the transfer of this distinction to the New Testament.[7]

---

[1] Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 70.

[2] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 20.

[3] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 61; says that placing these two words together represents the Hellenistic counterpart of the Hebraic holiness (Greek hosiotes) and righteousness (Greek diakaiosune), combined in Luke 1:75. These two become the religious ideal of the letters, "with its accent on settled piety expressing itself in a well-ordered life, which many find hard to assoicate with Paul."

[4] Shorey, op. cit., (Rep. x. 615b), p. 495f; Fowler, op. cit., (Theaet. 176b) p. 129f; and Josephus (Ant. vii, 9:1); and in Tit. 1:8.

[5] Lamb, op. cit., (Plato, Prot. 329c), p. 153f; 1 Thess. 2:10; Luke 1:17, Eph. 4:24; Wisdom 9:3; Clement of Rome (Cor. 48).

[6] Lamb, op. cit., (Plato, Gorg. 507b), p. 467; and B. Perrin, Plutarch, (Demet. 24), (William Heinemann, London, 1920), p. 55.

[7] Trench, op. cit., p. 329; says there is "nothing which would restrict dikaios to him who should fulfil accurately the precepts of the second table (thus see Lk. 1:6; Rom. 1:17; 1 Jh. 2:1); or hosios to him who should fulfil the demands of the first (thus see Acts 2:27; Heb. 7:26). It is beforehand unlikely that such distinction should there find place."

Dikaios denotes connection with tradition or custom.[1] Homer applied dikaios to a person who conforms, who is civilized, and who observes the correct custom.[2] Plato used dikaios as a description of the men who fulfil their obligation to men and to God.[3] And Aristotle used it in a legal sphere. He said a man is righteous who observes legal norms.[4] Therefore, dikaios in the Greek world applied to a person who observed the custom, the law, and discharged his obligation to man and God.

Dikaios also has significance for the whole of life. This was especially true in the Hellenistic world, since life for the Hellenist demanded a plenitude of virtues. It became a leading term in their ethics. The Stoic interpretation of the term makes it particularly clear that man was here understood statically rather than historically. Thus dikaios describes an existing and controllable habit of a man himself; and in the further development of the concept, in the history of ethics, we are always concerned with an existing state to which a man conforms.[5] Philo made even more use of the word in a list of virtues.[6] His enthusiastic extolling of the dikaios gives evidence of the Hellenistic glorification of man.[7]

A decisive change in the word dikaios occurred when it arrived in the LXX. This happened when it came under the influence of Old Testament motifs.

> "If in the rest of Greek world a man is dikaios who satisfies ordinary legal norms, fulfiling his civic duties in the most general sense, here the dikaios is the man who fulfils his duties toward God and the theocratic society, meeting God's claim in this relationship. It is as he satisfies the demand of God that he has right on his side and therefore a righteous cause before God."[8]

---

[1] Kittel, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 182, (Gottlob Schrenk).
[2] A. T. Murray, Homer (Od. 6, 119f), (William Heinemann, London, 1919), p. 215.
[3] Lamb, op. cit., Plato (Gorg. 507b), p. 467.
[4] Rackham, op. cit., (NE, v. 2, 1129a, 33), p. 253f.
[5] Kittel, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 183, (Gottlob Schrenk).
[6] Colson, op. cit., (Leg. All. II, 18), vol. 7.
[7] Kittel, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 183, (Gottlob Schrenk).
[8] Kittel, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 185, (Gottlob Schrenk).

The crucial religious importance of the term dikaios in the New Testament was prepared for in Hellenistic Judaism. It was in this setting that God is called dikaios. God is consistent in the normative self-expression of his own nature, and he maintains an unswerving faithfulness in the fulfilment of his promises and covenant agreements.[1] Thus Hellenistic Judaism laid the foundation for the religious importance of the term in the New Testament.

There is a great gulf between the meaning dikaios in the New Testament and the Greek ideal of virtue. For a Greek righteousness is an achievement of man. In the letters of the New Testament righteousness, as it is in the Old Testament, is the gift of God.[2]

Hosios has a religious background also. In the Greek world it relates to three things. First, hosios describes actions. Philo spoke of the sacred or lawful actions.[3] Second, hosios refers to things as being sanctified, pure or absolved.[4] Third, it is used to describe persons who feel inward awe before the gods and the eternal laws. The man who is hosios is the man who acts piously. It is thus, that Plato used hosios.[5]

In the Septuagint hosios is used of persons twenty-four times.[6] It can be used of God (Ps. 145:17; Dt. 32:4), but it's much more frequently used of men. The term becomes a self-designation of the righteous who call themselves οἱ ὅσιοι.[7]

---

[1] Kittel, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 185, (Gottlob Screnk).

[2] Dependence on the Old Testament: Rev. 16:5 - God is called good. Acts 3:13 - used to describe piety of Jesus in fulfilment of the will of God. Mt. 23:25; Heb. 1:14; 1 Jh. 3:12; 2 Pet. 2:7 - gives reference to men who do God's will. Mt. 10:41 - used of the disciple who fulfils Law or divine will. Rom. 2:13 - for Paul, the dikaios is the one who as a doer of the Law will be declared righteous by the divine sentence.

[3] Colson, and Whitaker, (Sacr. AC, 130), vol. 2, op. cit., p. 189.

[4] Kittel, op. cit., vol. 5, p. 490; (Aesch. Choeph. 378; Sib. iv, 23), (Friedrich Hauck).

[5] Lamb, op. cit., (Gorg. 50), p. 467; (Resp. II, 363c); and Kittel, op. cit., (F. Hauck), vol. 5, p. 490; lists M. Ant. vii, 66, 3; and Aristoph. Ra. 336.

[6] In Psalms and Deuteronomy.

[7] Kittel, op. cit., vol. 5, p. 491; Ps. 12:1, 18:26, 32:6, (F. Hauck).

Oddly enough, hosios is not very common in the New Testament. The term occurs only eight times, of which five are in quotations.[1] It does not occur in the gospels, the main Pauline letters, or the Catholic Epistles. With anosios, the term is common only in the Pastorals whose vocabulary is more strongly Hellenistic. Hosios occurs alongside dikaios four times. In the New Testament the basic idea is what is right and good before God and man.[2]

Two main ideas grow from dikaios in the Pastorals. The first idea explains what a man should be,[3] the other, what he should follow.[4] Both express character as example.

A man's character and convictions are reflected in what he follows and what he responds to. This is the reason for being just. This is a proper action towards others - God and man. To be dikaios becomes a goal. It is not something handed to man to use, but something he acquires through work. He is to be just and follow after righteousness as part of the height of the Christian character. Even though righteousness is listed as a virtue, it is not indicated as being a gift, unless it was given through faith. It is not an honor bestowed on man, but an honor man acquires through his devout character. Righteousness becomes a compelling motive for the conduct of all life.

Righteousness is also grouped with the highest of Christian ideals (love, godliness, faith, patience, meekness, peace) and seems to be considered as separate, yet inclusive within them. Righteousness becomes the opposite of vices and youthful lusts. Man's aim should be righteousness and this is what he should follow, avoiding youthful lusts and passions.

---

[1] Two are in hymns - Rev. 16:5, 15:4; and three are in speeches - Acts 2:27, 13:35; Heb. 7:26.

[2] Kittel, op. cit., vol. 5, p. 491, (Friedrick Hauck).

[3] 1 Tim. 1:9f, and Tit. 1:8.

[4] 1 Tim. 6:11, and 2 Tim. 2:22.

There is also an emphasis on the legal aspect of righteousness.[1] In 1 Timothy 1:9, the use of the Law is for the control of the lawless, as contrasted with the Christian who is righteous. The freedom of the Christian from the Law comes from the fact that he conducts himself according to the divine norm. To reach a just decision has to be one of his qualities.

After looking at the Pastoral use of dikaios, let us now look at hosios as used in the Pastorals. Hosios is grouped with many descriptions of the Christian in Titus 1:8. It has a special meaning in relation to two of the previously mentioned adjectives (sophron and dikaios). Scott says there is no reason to look for any special motive in the selection or arrangement of these virtues,[2] but I believe there is reason to connect these three. Hosios, sophron, and dikaios may have been put down at random, but they certainly convey more than just a general idea of the type of man to be chosen as a leader.

Sophron deals with man's duty to himself. Dikaios expresses man's duty to his neighbor. Hosios describes man's duty to God.[3] In other words man is to possess self-control, have respect for the rights of others, and have true piety towards God. Hosios becomes one of the positive characteristics required of a leader. It is man's inward attitude towards God. It is the basis of true justice.

Another side of hosios may be seen in 1 Timothy 2:8, concerning the lifting of holy hands while praying. This is an outward gesture of man's purity. The lifting of hands is futile and blasphemous unless they are clean from evil deeds and the heart within is free from ill-will.[4] The idea is one of moral purity combined

---

[1] Arndt and Gindrich, op. cit., p. 194.
[2] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 156.
[3] Lock, op. cit., p. 131.
[4] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 66.

with that of consecration. Worshippers with stained hands due to unworthy deeds must first be cleansed before approaching God in prayer (Ps. 26:6). Holy is used in 1 Timothy 2:8, as an outward expression; whereas, in Titus 1:8, it is used as an inward expression of purity in the sight of God. 1 Timothy 2:8 follows the Greek usage, and its expression was originally cultic. The lifting of holy hands symbolises freedom from ungodly thought and action.[1] Hosios becomes a word transferred to the "religio-ethical" field.[2]

Epieikes defines another aspect of the Pastoral ethic. The Greek used it for that which is fitting, right or equitable. Homer used epieikes to describe the works of the gods (Iliad, 19, 21), and Aristotle (Ep. 192:207) used it as a description of God. Plato (Leg., I, 6506) used it in terms of what was serviceable, and Xenophon (Hist. Graec. I, 1, 30) spoke of the seasoned man who stays within his limits of what is moderate and orderly. To the Greek, epieikes defined the fitting person who does what is right.

Aristotle's view of epieikeia has been summed up by Mayor thus:

> "It is to pardon human failings, and to look to the law-giver and not to the law, to the spirit and not to the letter, to the intention and not to the act, to the whole and not to the part, to remember good rather than evil."[3]

Aristotle viewed epieikeia as more just than strict justice would have been.[4] He even gave a full description of epieikeia.[5] The mere existence of such a term as epieikes is evidence of the high development of ethics among the Greeks.[6]

---

[1]Kittel, op. cit., vol. 5, p. 492, (Friedrich Hauch).
[2]Arndt and Gindrich, op. cit., p. 589.
[3]J. B. Mayor, Epistle of St. James, (MacMillan and Co., London, 1892), p. 126.
[4]Rackham, op. cit., (NE, v, 10.6), p. 317; and L. H. Marshall, The Challenge of New Testament Ethics, (MacMillan and Co., London, 1956), p. 307; "This suggests that epieikia means in part, willingness to make concessions, mildness, leniency."
[5]Freese, (Rhet, i, xiii), op. cit., p. 147f.

In the LXX, epieikes is used to describe God's disposition as a ruler.[1] It explains the kindness or goodness that God displays as King. Epieikes is used of earthly kings,[2] and of men close to God who should thus be holy. An example is the prophet Elisha (4 Kings 6:3), and the righteous man who is the son of God (Wis. 2:19).

Epieikes was used by Josephus in three different ways. First, he used the term to describe God.[3] Second, the prophet Samuel is described as protecting the people from the wrath of God.[4] Third, a great lawgiver is represented as a man of gentleness who demands gentleness even in relation to aliens. Therefore, we see Josephus used epieikes to describe God, a prophet, and the lawgiver. And Philo used epieikes of Moses.[5] He used the term also to describe the mildness of a ruler,[6] and the goodness of God.[7]

In the New Testament, epieikeia is used of the meekness of Christ who is held up as a model for Paul and the community (2 Cor. 10:1). The term becomes a complement of heavenly majesty. Christ is such that he displays saving, forgiving, and redeeming mercy even to his personal enemies. "Thus in epieikeia there is given to Paul and the community a sign of their supraterrestial possession."[8] The same occurs in Philippians 4:5. Man can be gentle to all men in spite of persecution. This becomes not a weakness, but an "earthly outworking of an eschatological possession."[9]

---

[6]Trench, op. cit., p. 153f; "It expresses exactly that moderation which recognises the impossibility of cleaving to all formal law, of anticipating and providing for all cases that will emerge, and present themselves to it for decision; which, with this, recognises the danger that ever waits upon the assertion of legal rights, lest they should be pushed into moral wrongs, lest the summum jus should in practice prove the summa injuria; which, therefore, urges not its rights to the uttermost, but, going back in part or in the whole from these, rectifies and redresses the injustices of justice."

---

[1]Kittel, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 589; Wisdom 12:18, Bar. 2:27, D. 3:42, 4:24, 2 Macc. 2:27, 10:4, (Herbert Preisker).
[2]Est. 3:13, 8:13; 2 Macc. 9:27; 3 Macc. 3:15, 7:6.
[3]Marcus, op. cit., (Ant. 10, 83), p. 203.

The Pastorals insist that epieikeia must be a mark of the Christian leader (1 Tim. 3:3; Tit. 3:2). Every leader should have certain qualities, and this quality is basic. The author means to say that every Christian leader should have gracious forbearing in order to deal with those in his charge. Christian leaders are to be gentle toward all men because of their calling.[1] Epieikeia should be the mark of all Christians, but expecially of the leader. The leader is to be temperate with all, not pressing his own rights, but remembering that the heathen does not know of the love of God unless he has seen the gentle, temperate, reasonable, considerate virtues within the Christian leader.[2] The leader who possesses such a Christian virtue is supported by the example of Christ. To be gentle and desirous to do the fair thing to everyone, is a special virtue of Christian leadership, and is found in the man who is epieikes. It occurs with other adapted Hellenistic duties, and is to be taken in its specific early Christian sense. The reference is to the leader of the community, who is endowed with authority and who acts as the representative of the community with eschatological assurance, and in virtue of eschatological possession.[3]

Throughout the Pastorals, the author gives warning as to what a Christian should not be. 1 Timothy 3:3 and Titus 2:3-5 are examples of such warning.

---

[4]Thackeray and Marcus, op. cit., (Ant. 6, 92), p. 213.
[5]Colson, op. cit., (Virt. 81, 125, 140, 148), vol. 8, pp. 211, 239, 249, 255.
[6]Colson and Whitaker, op. cit., (Som. II, 295), p. 575.
[7]Colson, op. cit., (Spec. Leg. I, 97), p. 155.
[8]Kittel, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 590, (H. Priesker).
[9]Kittel, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 590, (H. Priesker).

---

[1]Falconer, op. cit., p. 134.
[2]Lock, op. cit., p. 152.
[3]Kittel, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 590, (H. Priesker).

But when the term epieikes appears in the 1 Timothy passage it is the sole positive quality, surrounded by negative qualities. Such negative excesses are clearly quite alien to the Christian spirit.[1] Therefore, the author offers, by contrast, a positive virtue. After a strong prohibition of extreme cases of excess (not given to wine, no striker, no brawler), the author offers a positive moderate approach - one should be patient or forbearing under such circumstances.

When we sum up the evidence of the previous paragraphs and of the background of epieikeia we see that its essential meaning is fair-mindedness. It is the attitude of a man who is charitable towards men's faults and merciful in his judgement of their failings. The reason for this is because the person who possesses epieikeia is the one who takes the whole situation into his reckoning. He is fairminded in all respects. The exact translation or definition of the Greek noun epieikeia and the corresponding adjective epieikes is not easy to decide.[2] Fairminded or gracious is probably the closest to the meaning. Each Christian should display this quality.

The study of the ethic of the Pastorals could not be complete without a thorough examination of the word kalos. Its background will show us its depth. The higher moral aspects and uses of kalos are most interesting to note. An example of this is the perfect freedom with which it moves alike in the world of beauty and in that of goodness, claiming both for its own.[3]

For Plato, the kalon was closely related to the idea of the agathon, the good, which is the "central idea which unites us with the divine."[4]

---

[1] Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 81.
[2] Marshall, op. cit., p. 306.
[3] Trench, op. cit., p. 389.
[4] Kittel, op. cit., vol. 3, p. 540, (Walter Grundmann).

Kalon is not merely the result of the good, its also an aspect of the good. The question of the good is central in Platonic philosophy and therefore in Greek thought.

> "It is the moving force of the Greek spirit, for which in a rare harmony, supreme intellectual knowledge is a vision of the breadth and multiplicity of the kalon. It is the eternal thrust of the Greek striving for self-fulfilment."[1]

For Aristotle, the kalon was divided into two areas. First, he spoke of that which is naturally beautiful,[2] and secondly, that which is morally beautiful.[3] Stoicism followed the same view as Aristotelianism.[4] One sees that the idea of good is split, and therefore the comprehensive Platonic view is lost.

In Latin kalos is translated honestus,[5] and Cicero said:

> "By moral worth, then, we understand that which is of such a nature that, though devoid of all utility, it can justly be commended in and for itself, apart from any profit or reward."[6]

Tacitus described someone as honestus:

> "He followed the teaching of those philosophers who hold that virtue is the only good, that nothing is evil but what is base, and who account power, high birth, and all other things outside the mind, as neither good nor evil."[7]

When we come to Philo, we find the religious character of kalon that was found in Plato, is found again in Hellenistic philosophy. Philo gave kalon a

---

[1] Kittel, op. cit., vol. 3, p. 541, (W. Grundmann).
[2] A. L. Peck, Aristotle, (Part. An. I, 1, p. 639b, 20), (William Heinemann, London, 1937), p. 57.
[3] Freese, op. cit., (Rhet. 1, 7), p. 79f.
[4] Hicks, op. cit., (Diog. Laert. VII, 100), p. 207.
[5] Barclay, op. cit., (MNTW), p. 93.
[6] Rackham, op. cit., (De Fin. 2.45), p. 133; goes on to say that "good men do a great many things from which they anticipate no advantage, solely from the motive of propriety, morality and right."
[7] Ramsay, op. cit., (Hist. 4.5), p. 299.

religious significance. He adopted Stoic motifs on the one hand,[1] but on the other hand, he was influenced both by the Old Testament, and by religious Hellenism and Plato.[2]

In the LXX kalos means beautiful in respect to outward appearance.[3] It expresses beauty contemplated from a point of view especially dear to the Greek mind: "as the harmonious completeness, the balance, proportion, and measure of all the parts one with another ..."[4] In the LXX kalos can also means useful or serviceable (Gen. 2:9), and morally good (Prov. 17:21). In most cases, kalos means morally good, inthe framework of Old Testament and Jewish ethics. Many times kalos is used synonymously with agathos.[5]

In the New Testament, kalos is used in the parables.[6] In the synoptic kerygma, the adjective kalos is oriented to the word of the kingdom of God.[7] In John 10:11, 14, kalos is in a significant context in the address on the good shepherd. And in Paul it denotes the good which we wish to do inwardly, but which conflicts with the Law of the flesh so that we cannot achieve the kalon. Kalos is also used for the new possibility of the Christian life.[8] It is used too, of that which is right, good, praiseworthy, and valuable.[9]

Julicher maintains in his Einleitung: "It is no accident that kalos alone is used twenty-four times in the Pastorals and only sixteen times in the ten

---

[1] Colson, op. cit., (Spec. Leg. II, 73; Migr. Abr. 86), pp. 353, 181.
[2] Kittel, op. cit., vol. 3, p. 542, (W. Grundmann).
[3] Gen. 12:14, 29:17, 39:6, 41:2.
[4] Trench, op. cit., p. 389.
[5] Kittel, op. cit., p. 544, vol 3, (W. Grundmann).
[6] Matt. 3:10; 13:24, 27, 37, 38; Lk. 3:9.
[7] Kittel, op. cit., vol. 3, p. 548, (W. Grundmann).
[8] 2 Cor. 13:7.
[9] 1 Cor. 7:1, 8, 26.

Pauline Epistles." Furthermore he says that Paul almost always used kalon as a noun, whereas in the Pastoral Epistles kalos is used twenty times as an adjective.[1] In the Pastorals, kalos is oriented to the gospel as understood by the second generation. The external appearance and demonstration for Christian conduct became increasingly imperative as the opening stage passed and the world position of Christianity had to be considered.[2] The term kalos occupied a significant role in this struggle of transition. The good life of the Christian must have been one of the chief means of winning the heathen to Christ; and, therefore, what was at issue was a mode of life fashioned by love and based on faith.

Goodness (kalos) is first linked with the law (1 Tim. 1:8). The law is good if used correctly. The primary purpose of the law is to restrain the evil doer, therefore the use of kalos rather than agathos is significant. The former draws attention to beauty of the outward form as well as to excellence of intrinsic quality. The author does not decry the noble precepts of the Mosaic law, but opposes "the futilities of much Pentateuchal speculation."[3] His point is that Christians who live by the spirit appreciate the place of the law and its precepts in working out God's purposes. Therefore, in this sense the law is good.

Goodness is also connected with military pictures (1 Tim. 1:18, 6:12; 2 Tim. 2:3). Timothy was to take charge and wage the good warfare because of the inspiration of prophetic utterances. The Christian leader becomes the Christian warrior.[4] He is armed with faith and a good conscience (1 Tim. 1:19). This shows the connection between religion and morality. The Christian

---

[1] A. Julicher and E. Fascher, Einleitung in das Neues Testament, 1931, p. 169.
[2] Kittel, op. cit., vol. 3, p. 550, (W. Grundmann).
[3] Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 60.
[4] This is typical of Paul, who likes to depict the apostolic leader as a Christian warrior (1 Cor. 9:7; 2 Cor. 10:3; Phil. 2:25).

is to fight the good fight (1 Tim. 6:12). The Christian is to bear suffering like a loyal soldier of Jesus Christ (2 Tim. 2:3). The idea implied is primarily that of aiding Christ.[1] Attention here is on the discipline imposed on the Christian. He is to be prepared, like a good soldier, to endure every hardship.

A man's occupation and goodness have a link in the Pastorals. Everyone should learn to apply themselves to good works, so as to help cases of urgent need (Tit. 3:14), and not to be unfruitful. Titus was urged to show himself in all respects a model of good deeds (Tit. 2:7). This is a favorite expression in this epistle, and Titus is used as the example of the ideal Christian who in his daily tasks should exemplify such qualities. If anyone desires to be a bishop, he desires a good work, or a noble task (1 Tim. 3:1). And if he rules his household well (1 Tim. 3:4), he shows that he has the power of control as part of his character. If he is a deacon and serves well, he can gain a good standing for himself (1 Tim. 3:13). Therefore, goodness and occupation have a link that connects them with each other.

As for the wealthy, their lives too must be linked with goodness (1 Tim. 6:18-19). The idea of being rich in good works is common in the Pastorals (1 Tim. 2:10, 5:10, 25; 2 Tim. 2:21, 3:17; Tit. 1:16, 2:7, 14, 3:1, 8, 14). But the emphasis emerges from the context of this verse. In verse 17, the rich or wealthy are charged not to have their hopes set on the present world, but on God. They are to do good, to be rich in good deeds, liberal and generous, thus laying up for themselves a good foundation (1 Tim. 6:18-19). The emphasis is upon their good actions on this earth for God. They should be ready to share what they have - this is the good deed or good work. This is the positive and practical demand laid upon the rich. Their actions are to be characterised by

---

[1]Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 101; says perhaps this idea "owed something to the Persian conception of a struggle between the mysterious principles of good and evil, in which all men were required to bear their part."

goodness and generosity, both of which are described actively and passively.[1] The best way to use God's gifts is to do good with them.[2]

To be good or to do good is linked with many things - the law, military pictures, one's occupation and the use of wealth. Basically, goodness has a sense of universality. 1 Timothy 4:4 says everything created by God is good, and nothing is to be rejected. The passage when taken out of context contains the idea that all is good. When the passage is taken in context it refers to the principle of abolishing all food laws and taboos. We should take this passage in context, but not limit its meaning. What God creates is good, but what man does tarnishes it. The passage is either a clear reference to Genesis 1,[3] or its meaning is that everything which God bestows must be good, since it comesfrom him.[4]

Goodness is the virtue of the Christian. Good works constitute the badge of the Christian. This is urged on the Christian, as the observance of the Law was urged on the Jews. 2 Timothy 3:17 says the purpose of Old Testament scripture is described as to thoroughly equip the man of God for every good work. Widows who want to be on the church's roll must be attested by good works (1 Tim. 5:10). The rich are to be wealthy in good works (1 Tim. 6:18-19). Titus 1:16 shows that the useless are that way because of their uselessness for every kind of good work. And even in 2 Timothy 2:21, we see that consecration to God means being prepared for every good work.

Even the object of Christ's redemption is described as that of purifying a people for himself who should be eager for good works (Tit. 2:14). God purified for himself a peculiar people for the very purpose that they should be zealous for good works, that they should rise above the level of the world, and exhibit the beauty of holiness.

---

[1]Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 118.
[2]Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 88.
[3]Lock, op. cit., p. 48; and Parry, op. cit., p. 25.
[4]Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 46.

Before leaving the terms kalos and agathos it would be well to state the distinction between them. Kalos always implies beauty and attractiveness. It is the good that is seen, the good which makes a direct impression on those who come into contact with it; whereas, agathos is good in result.[1] The difference was still present in Hellenistic Greek when the Pastorals were written, though the contrast had been blurred.[2] Kalos is more impressionistic and therefore has a deeper meaning in the Pastorals. For, the impression given to others was an important element in the Christian character.

The previous pages have been concerned with terms that constitute the core of the ethic of the Pastorals. Each term represents an element in this ethic. They are the guidelines to every Christian. They represent the standard for every individual within the church. The Christian ethic that followed grew out of these great cardinal virtues. It was insisted that the Christian must possess them, because the ethical quality of the individual Christian was the strongest argument for Christianity that the church had.

The moral teaching of the Pastoral Epistles is presented in a different way from the rest of the New Testament. The emphasis is not upon the Holy Spirit's work bringing into being the fruit of the Christian character. The Holy Spirit is mentioned only once in this connection (2 Tim. 1:14). But, there are numerous lists of moral and immoral qualities for the Christian to observe and to avoid. The broad ethical pattern of the New Testament morality becomes very stiff in the Pastorals.

In the Pastorals the Christian ethic and ideal is one of loyal spirit, showing love and endurance. It is an ethic of gentleness, and kindness. It is designed to produce a character free from the grosser sins and not contentious.

---

[1] F. J. A. Hort, The Epistle of St. James, (MacMillan and Co., London, 1909), p. 52.

[2] Lock, op. cit., p. 22; "The distinction between agathos, practically good, morally good, and kalos, aesthetically good, beautiful, good to men's eyes is still present in Hellenistic Greek, though the contrast is blurred."

This type of ethic is similar to that of the rest of the New Testament; but the Pastorals do not stop there, for there is a new feature. The Christian is also to be sober, grave, godly, just, and good. The Christian character is one of profound seriousness. Joy, which is so prevalent in Paul, is not even mentioned in the Pastoral Epistles. The environment is almost too serious, as if to react against a laxity in the Christian way of life. Thus, we see how the ethic of the Pastorals emerged. It emerged within a situation in which there arose the question of correct doctrine as well as right conduct, of a proper attitude to the surrounding world as well as true wrestling with the various movements which opposed the faith.

The theological character of Christian morality comes out in the Pastorals in an expression which is peculiar to them and most characteristic of them.[1] Moral health and soundness are expressed in the phrases sound doctrine and sound teaching. This health is not in men but in truths (teaching, 2 Tim. 4:3; Tit. 1:9, 2:1; 1 Tim. 1:10; word, 2 Tim. 1:13; Tit. 2:8; 1 Tim. 6:3; faith, Tit. 1:13, 2:2). This metaphor is common in the Pastorals and confined to these epistles.[2] The phrase, sound doctrine, emphasizes an ordered regulated life, and is found in Stoic writers.[3] Thus the author of the Pastoral Epistles writes that certain persons should be reproved, that they may be sound in the faith (Tit. 1:13). Also, others should be sound in faith, love and patience (Tit. 2:2). A clear indication between faith and morals is expressed when the author says, faith "adorns the doctrine" (Tit. 2:10). Purity of doctrine is not constituted through the ministry but rather the reverse is said in the Pastorals Epistles. The ministry is constituted by the preservation of the doctrine.[4]

---

[1] Dewar, op. cit., p. 242.
[2] Lock, op. cit., p. 12.
[3] John Jackson, Marcus Aurelius, (viii, 30), (Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1906), p. 130.
[4] Conzelmann, op. cit., p. 299.

The healthy, wholesome expression of the doctrine and the faith shows the theological character of the Pastorals. This wholesome teaching defines the authentic Christian message as applied to conduct.[1] The author is stating that a morally disordered life is fatal. The word "sound" (literally, healthy) has an allusion to the diseases of the soul, which is probably not used here,[2] but is in the background of the thought. Whether it refers to sound teaching or a sound life, the phrase provides an admirable metaphor of the cleanness and wholesomeness of the Christian life which is inculcated in these epistles.[3] The ethic of the Christian begins in a wholesome way, with sound healthy doctrine as its background.

The relationship existing in the author's mind between faith and morality is further indicated by a phrase used often by him: faith and a good conscience (1 Tim. 1:5, 19 and clear conscience in 1 Tim. 3:9). The term conscience is found twenty times in Paul (five times in the Pastorals), as against ten times in the rest of the New Testament. It is a term that was frequently used from the first century onwards in the Greek vernacular and Latin popular philosophical writings.[4] The term was also familiar to Philo, but he adopted it to suit his belief in revelation and his personal concept of God.[5] According to the Pastoral Epistles a person's moral judgement will be perfectly sound when his belief is right.[6] Therefore, the moral condition of the individual is the goal of his Christian life. For Paul, faith was sufficient; but the author of the Pastorals thinks of faith as a believing frame of mind which needs to be supplemented by a change of heart and a moral effort.

---

[1] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 50.
[2] Lock, op. cit., p. 12.
[3] Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 43.
[4] Rudolf Schnackenburg, The Moral Teaching of the New Testament, (Burns and Oates, London, 1965), p. 288; "After a thorough examination of the question, J. Dupont, Syneidesis, p. 123-46, reaches the conclusion that the Pauline concept of conscience was rooted in popular philosophy as may be demonstrated by the Latin writers of the first century BC."
[5] Ibid., p. 288.
[6] Dewar, op. cit., p. 244.

The author of the Pastorals refers to the conscience of the false teachers as seared (1 Tim. 4:2), and corrupted (Tit. 1:15). They profess to know God but deny him by their deeds. Therefore the strong emphasis on the necessity for the Christian to have a pure or good conscience is justified.

To possess a good or pure conscience means avoiding three wrong practices which the deacon must avoid (1 Tim. 3:9). The deacon is not to be double-tongued, addicted to much wine, or greedy for gain. He is to hold to the mystery of the faith with a good conscience. Timothy was also to wage the good warfare, holding faith and good conscience (1 Tim. 1:19). These passages must mean avoidance of sin.[1] Therefore, a good conscience is paired with faith as a deterrent to sin. For in 1 Timothy 1:19 neither love nor heart is mentioned, but a good conscience is paired with faith.

This mode of expression does not appear in the earlier Pauline epistles. In the Pastorals the cause of sound teaching is evident, which produces another trustworthy feature - consciousness. Conscience now stands generally like a "watchful cherub before the portal of the faith, before the temple of religious doctrinal truth."[2]

Thus it is obvious that the theological character of the moral teaching of the Pastorals is grounded in sound doctrine and a good conscience. The Christian is to live a clean and wholesome life, holding to a sound doctrine and possessing a good conscience because he holds to the mystery of the faith.

The great triad of theological virtues - faith, love, and hope - also appear in the Pastorals. Man's attitude to God is expressed in this Pauline triad.[3] These theological virtues are firmly established in the Pastorals, just as they are in the other New Testament books. But, by the time the

---

[1] C. A. Pierce, Conscience in the New Testament, (SCM Press, London, 1955), p. 96.

[2] Schnackenburg, op. cit., p. 290.

[3] Faith: 1 Tim. 1:4, 1:14, 2:15, 4:12; Tit. 3:15; Love: 1 Tim. 1:5, 1:14; Hope: 1 Tim. 1:1, 4:10, 5:6,

Pastorals were written, these virtues had come to receive a recognised place in Christian morality. Therefore, the impression that is given by these three virtues is that their significance could be taken for granted by anyone addressing the Christian community.

The term faith is a good example of this.[1] Ten of the instances of the term refer to the corpus of the Christian doctrine, which has no certain parallel in the undoubted Pauline epistles.[2] Eight of the remaining passages join faith and love, which is one of the most characteristic modes of speech in the Pastorals.[3] Absent are the Pauline expressions "faith in Christ" and "of faith," which occur frequently in the authentic Pauline epistles.

"Faith which is in Christ Jesus" (1 Tim. 3:13; 2 Tim. 3:15), occurs and has no parallel in other epistles. The term faith seems to have a general meaning of loyalty or fidelity in a moral sense in the Pastorals. The preposition "in" before faith (1 Tim. 3:13) marks the power which animates it, rather than the object of it.[4] We are concerned here with the exercise of faith, not the body of Christian doctrine as in other passages. The passages are to be interpreted in the sense of moral and religious understanding.

In all but one of the passages where love occurs, it is joined with faith. In 2 Timothy 1:13, faith and love are the best representation the author can give in summary form of the wholesome teaching he has received. This is typical of the epistles. The character of the teacher must be consistent with the contents of his teaching.

---

[1] The theological concept of faith will be handled under such heading in the next section of this paper.

[2] Dewar, op. cit., p. 246.

[3] Dewar, op. cit., p. 246; "It is noteworthy that there are only three passages in the whole of the other Pauline letters in which this conjunction of the two substantives takes place."

[4] Parry, op. cit., p. 20.

The use of the term love is a great illustration of the way in which Christian morality is "schematized" in these epistles.[1] Love is introduced in a formal way. It occurs four times in a catalogue of virtues (1 Tim. 6:11; 2 Tim. 2:22, 3:10; Tit. 2:2). Each of these times love is paired with faith. They are regarded as specific virtues, and in 1 Timothy 6:11, they need to be combined with patience and meekness. Faith becomes a quality in men, and love gives fire to this faith and becomes a specific moral condition of the godly life.

There are only seven instances where hope appears in the Pastorals (1 Tim. 1:1, 4:10, 5:5, 6:17; Tit. 1:2, 2:13, 3:7). In three of these passages hope is directed towards the life to come. The verb to hope likewise occurs only four times, only two of which have reference to the Christian virtue of hope.[2] There is little emphasis upon this virtue in these epistles. Where faith and love are bracketed together, hope is omitted. Hope has lost its position as a virtue. Therefore, one can see two of the three Christian virtues (faith and love) now have a standard place in Christian morality. This is the impression they give in the Pastorals.

The ethic of the Pastorals takes many forms. Therefore, it is my intention to list the different ethical patterns and explain each one in its biblical context.

One of the obvious ethics that emerges is the negative ethic.[3] There are three lists of vices in the Pastorals, and they have a similarity with Paul's lists. Of the forty different terms, twenty-one of them appear in the

---

[1] Dewar, op. cit., p. 248.
[2] Dewar, op. cit., p. 249.
[3] I am calling it this because there are three lists of vices in the Pastorals: 1 Tim. 1:9-10, 2 Tim. 3:2-4, Tit. 3:2-3. But I am leaving out the lists of virtues that have a negative connotation under this heading. Also I am including the charges against the false teachers.

acknowledged Pauline epistles. But, the emphasis is different. There is hardly any mention of sexual sin in the Pastorals, and Paul's strong emphasis on covetousness is absent. Also there seems to be far less emphasis on the sins of the tongue and of the temper.[1] It is also evident that the Lord's list of vices and these in the Pastorals have a close similarity.[2] This helps to indicate that the Christian moral tradition shows a consistency in the New Testament.

The first list (1 Tim. 1:9-10) follows the order of the Decalogue, the general refusal to obey the law, the law of God and the Commandments.[3] These vices are not wholesome and are against the ordered, regulated life. Such lists are found in the Stoic writers also.[4] The vices describe a rejection of all the external standards or controls of basic living, whether those approved by God or set up by man. One who is guilty of these vices refuses to recognise the claims of law, or any control, and rejects God and religion. He is more than just profane, he is unclean.[5] And to be a kidnapper was a serious thing. The use of such a word shows the seriousness of these vices. For slavery was common, and to reduce a free person to slavery, or kidnap him, meant death by law. Although most of these vices are crimes, the author reminds his readers of the things which destroy them psychologically and spirtually. Liars, the unruly, the impious, the unholy are also condemned.

The second list of vices is in 2 Timothy 3:2-4. They are not the vices of people who are hostile to religion or who are outside the church. They are

---

[1] Dewar, op. cit., p. 251.

[2] Dewar, op. cit., p. 252; "... taking into consideration the sins condemned, as distinct from the terms used to describe them, every one of those mentioned by our Lord reappear in these lists provided that we were right in interpreting 'an evil eye' as the equivalent of envy."

[3] Lock, op. cit., p. 12.

[4] Jackson, op. cit., p. 130.

[5] Hillard, op. cit., p. 9; "The word bebalos to a Jew would mean one who by reason of uncleanness was banished from all religious observances."

the vices of people who have the outward form of religion but who deny its power. This list does have a parallel in Paul and in Philo.[1] The author is not thinking of a particular group of people, but is definitely voicing the apocalyptic foreboding of a general repudiation of law and decency. The epithets follow a pattern that seems to group them in pairs. In several cases they are linked by assonance.[2] The conclusion is that complete moral corruption is liable to continue and get worse when men abandon God (lovers of self and lovers of money).[3] Self-centeredness causes two more of the vices (boastful, haughty). The third set includes those which effect a man's relationship with other people. It deals with unworthy conduct (abusive, disobedient to parents). They are also ungrateful and unholy toward people. These people are without natural affection (inhuman),[4] as well as being implacable.

The next set of epithets paints an even more drastic picture of these evildoers. (slanderers, profligates, fierce, haters of good). They are also treacherous, reckless, swollen with conceit. They prefer pleasure, to God. In other words, they include vices against God, against society, vices of disposition, and of passion and desire. It is obvious that there is a powerful impression of moral anarchy.[5] Standards are lost, and men are vacillating in their moral belief, although they still hold the outward form of religion.

This second list of vices (2 Tim. 3:2-4) does not refer to false teachers, but to a moral corruption within the Christian ranks.[6] The author is speaking

---

[1] Hanson, op. cit., (C), p. 92; Rom. 1:29-31 and Philo (concerning "lovers of pleasure and sensual things, rather than lovers of virtue and of God;") and Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 111; and Falconer, op. cit, p. 90.

[2] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 193.

[3] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 194.

[4] Falconer, op. cit., p. 89; says this term is often used of the love of relatives, and plays an important part in the later Stor, because of the higher value placed on natural human feelings; and Adolf Bonhoeffer, Epiktet und das Neue Testament, (Gieben, 1911), p. 134; says it is one of the words Paul uses because of his great familiarity with Greek life.

[5] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 119.

[6] It may have been outgrowth of false teaching, but it deals specifically with individuals and their moral behavior.

of Christians not heathens, for the corruption has penetrated deeply into the church, and godliness in its true form, not its false form, must be the only acceptable way.

Some of these vices are the product of that false philosophy which the author of the Pastorals condemns and opposes.[1] This may be the philosophical impact that is being fought against in these epistles. This philosophy can take the form of religion, but it is no true religion. The list differs from 1 Timothy 1:9-10, for there are no great crimes against the law in it, these are rather vices against God and man. The list may reflect Stoic ethical thought, and has its emphasis on the pleasures that appeal to the senses (self-lovers, pleasure-lovers).

Titus 3:3 also has a list of vices,[2] but it does not refer to outsiders, but to the Christians to whom this letter is written. This list shows that they were once like their non-Christian friends, and that they needed to show the world that they had been transformed. The past is in the vices,[3] the future is in the gentle, meek,[4] Christian character of a transformed life. The vices reflect the opposite of gentleness and meekness.

---

[1] Simpson, op. cit., p. 143f; "lover of self" (Aristotle, NE, ix, 8); "boaster" (Plutarch, Mor. 523) (Aristotle, NE, ii, 7); "reckless" (Plutarch, Mor. 59, Polyb. iii, 81); "puffed up" (Sextus Empiricus, i, 62); "pleasure lover rather than God-lovers" (Philo, De Agre. 86).

[2] Tit. 3:3; senseless, disobedient, being deceived, serving lusts and pleasures, living in evil, envy, hateful, and hating one another.

[3] Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 203.

[4] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 249; reminds us that this is a quality often attributed in the New Testament to our Lord (Mt. 11:29; 21:5; 2 Cor. 10:1). "He himself praised it in the Beatitudes (Mt. 5:5) and Paul reckoned it one of the fruits of the Spirit (Gal. 5:23)."

[5] 1 Tim. 6:4-5; a list of characteristic sins of the false teachers: proud, understand nothing, diseased about questionings and strifes of words; out of which comes envy, strife, blasphemies, suspicious evil, perpetual wranglings and being corrupted, and destitute of the truth.

In 1 Timothy 6:4-5 there is a list of vices which are characteristic of the false teachers, and which are a contrast to real godliness. These false teachers are filled with an intellectual pride based on so-called knowledge. They are concerned with disputes about words, disputes which are divorced from realism. The teacher who neglects godliness falls into this state of living. Godliness constitutes the true form of Christian conduct and belief, and those who deny it are diseased with synthetic problems and verbal disputes. Truth has become meaningless to them. Their one concern is what they can get out of religion.[1]

Again, we feel that the form of godliness (2 Tim. 3:5) is assumed, possibly to promote unworthy ends.[2] The demand is to clear oneself of such unreal disputes and from teachings that have false motives, such as personal glorification or material gain. The false ethic has its answer and antidote in the true godliness, the depth of justice and goodness, and the character of gentleness and meekness. Each list of vices or false teaching has a Christian counterpart. In the Pastorals the Christian demand is not so much for life in the Spirit as it is to achieve a quality in life which will distinguish the Christian from the ordinary person.

On the one hand these vices are synonymous with sins, but on the other, they are the mark of a debased Christianity. The Christian had in some cases slipped into an attitude to life that produced this result. These vices fall into two categories - vices that are actual crimes, and vices that produce conduct which is lower than the Christian standard of living.

The next ethic is one of leadership. Leaders of the church had qualifications to aim at. This type of ethic will be divided in two parts - the

---

[1] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 74.
[2] Simpson, op. cit., p. 83.

ethic for appointed leaders (bishops and deacons), and the ethic for the charismatic leadership (Timothy).[1]

There are two lists of virtues necessary for the bishop (1 Tim. 3:2f; Tit. 1:6-9). Some of the terms are repeated in both lists.[2] It is noticeable immediately that these terms have no specific reason to be applied to bishops. They are simply virtues of the Christian character. But if the bishop fails to possess such qualities, he definitely should not be a bishop. These lists scarcely give the idea of the ideal of a bishop; they give the basic and necessary requirements for the character of a bishop. The terms parallel the Stoic description of the wise man, as given in Diogenes Laertius.[3]

These lists describe the bishop's duty in the home and in the community, as well as describing his personal character. Within the home the bishop has to be the husband of one wife, which could imply one of many things: 1) the bishop must be a married man; 2) no polygamy; 3) no divorce; 4) or possibly no remarriage.[4] It is clear that when one compares this virtue with the rest, the phrase husband of one wife implies an example of strict morality. In regard to the family, the bishop is to rule his own household well. This is in comparison with his duties within the church. The home is a microcosm of the church. If he can handle the problems of the home, he can handle the problems of the church; if not, he cannot rule the church either.

---

[1] Titus, although a leader, does not specifically have attention paid him, as Timothy does. Although we will assume both needed these qualifications.

[2] The repeated words are - 'without reproach, sensible, hospitable, not a drunkard, and not a striker.

[3] Lock, op. cit., pp. 35-6; reminds us that these and Titus 1:5-9, are getting stereotyped; also they parallel with the Stoic wise man; and Diog. Laert. vii, 116-26; and Wetstein and Dibelius quote the close analogy of these requirements for the choice of a general.

[4] Lock, op. cit., pp. 36-7; gives a long list of reasons, and exhausts the subject; and Alexander, (ESP), op. cit., p. 295; says it definitely means that the candidate for office is to be a husband of one wife.

Outside the church, the bishop is to refrain from wine, from striking people, and from being greedy. He is not to be self-willed, angry, or covetous. He is to be patient (forbearing or gentle), and his character is to be without reproach, blameless in the sight of others, because the bishop must be the walking example for the church.

The bishop is therefore to be soberminded, just, holy, and gentle, as an individual. His character is to be spotless. He is to keep the reputation of the church at heart (1 Tim. 3:7). There is a strong emphasis on the idea of maintaining the reputation of the church, as well as the individual, without reproach.

Within the community, the bishop is to be the example of hospitality (1 Tim. 3:2; Tit. 1:8). This should be the outward sign of his Christian love. The bishop should be apt to teach (1 Tim. 3:2). He is to fulfil an educator's role.[1] It is his sound doctrine that will convince the heathen (Tit. 1:9).

There are some demands which at first sight it would seem unnecessary even to mention. That they are mentioned seems to show that church leadership sometimes fell well below the standards it ought to maintain. 1 Timothy 3:3 and Titus 1:7b condemn certain actions of which some bishops must have been guilty. The bishop is not to be given to much wine (not a slave to drink).[2] He can drink, but he is to be moderate. He is to be temperate in the use of wine. Nor should he be a striker, or a brawler, or greedy for filthy lucre, or covetous. The bishop must not let his passions master him. Gentleness is the virtue he should possess to overcome these feelings.

Titus 1:1f makes it the responsibility of the leader to further the truth which is after godliness. The positive demands on the leader are that

---

[1] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 76; states that the overseers probably are to be identified with that group within the body of elders who are occupied with preaching and teaching, (5:17).

[2] Found only in 1 Timothy 3:3 and Titus 1:7.

he should be master of himself, upright, holy and self-controlled (Tit. 1:8). Thus, he will conquer and control the vices which threaten him.

The deacon also has to be virtuous (1 Tim. 3:8-13). He is asked to he no less than the bishop. He is asked first to be grave, which denotes an outward temper and an outward bearing. To possess such a quality meant not to compromise, for there was a danger of the serious standard of Christian life being contaminated by compromise with Gentile habits.[1]

The deacon is instructed like the overseer, not to be given to much wine, not to be greedy for filthy lucre, not to be double-tongued. This term double-tongued could refer to gossip;[2] it could forbid deacons to be "wind bags,"[3] or possibly the idea is that of saying one thing to one person and something different to another.[4]

So much required of the deacon is the same as what is demanded of the bishop. There is some indication that this is a step before the higher office,[5] because of the term standing. But probably standing (1 Tim. 3:13) means simply a step in the right direction, coupled with a good record, which led to a good standing and reputation in the community at large,[6] and possibly with God also.[7] Therefore, one can see a works relationship in order to gain favor with God and man.

The deacon who is semnos stands firm in his belief. He is one who can overcome vices and temptations. For his gravity will bring forth serious and holy decisions.

---

[1] Hillard, op. cit., p. 30.
[2] Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 83.
[3] Hanson, op. cit., (C), p. 43.
[4] Parry, op. cit., p. 18; and Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 81; and Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 84.
[5] Simpson, op. cit., p. 57; disagrees, and feels this idea would belong to a a later date; and Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 85; feels this could be the meaning but it is too early for an ordered ladder of ecclesiastical promotion.
[6] Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 62.
[7] Hillard, op. cit., p. 34; says the author must have been well aware of the dual meaning, and left it at that. "The man who has done well in the duties of ministering to others increases in favor both with God and with man."

Bishops and deacons are appointed or elected, but Timothy was called by Paul to lead. His leadership office is charismatic, and his virtues are different in depth. He is asked to be a good minister of Jesus Christ (1 Tim. 4:6), and he mustflee from all youthful lusts and follow righteousness, faith, charity, peace (2 Tim. 2:22), godliness, meekness and patience (1 Tim. 6:11). He is to acquire the extra that is missing in others. The depth of these qualities exemplifies the demand of leadership. They deal with the strict moral character of each man. They are central Christian virtues, first toward God, then towards man.[1]

The Pastorals have also much to say about the ethic of the family.[2] The family is a type of the church (1 Tim. 3:4-5). The church is compared to the family, and as in other epistles, household rules follow.[3] An interesting fact is that what is demanded of the individuals in the family is very similar to what is demanded of leaders. There is one standard for all and the same moral claims are made. The family ethic in the Pastorals is centered around individuals.

The older women are encouraged to be reverent and good teachers (Tit. 2:3). And in the same passage that are told not to be slanderers, or enslaved by much wine. High moral qualities are also demanded of the deacon's wife (1 Tim. 3:11).

No less is demanded of the younger women. There is a strong emphasis on them being obedient to their husbands (Tit. 2:4-5). Their ethic is strongly a family one; and if they succeed in holding their qualities high, the word of God will not be blasphemed (Tit. 2:5).

---

[1] Lock, op. cit., p. 71; reminds us that these virtues are the ones especially needed for enduring trial, and the opposition of false teachers.

[2] Tit. 2:1f deals with aged men (2:2), aged women (2:3), young women (2:4-5), and young men (2:6-8). 1 Tim. 5:4 (widows). 1 Tim. 3:11 (wives of deacons). 1 Tim. 3:4 (leader in the home).

[3] Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 133; says household rules in other epistles include Eph. 5:22-6:9; Col. 3:18-4:1; 1 Pet. 2:18-3:9.

The older men have to be grave, sober, temperate and sound in faith, charity and patience (Tit. 2:2), and younger men the same (Tit. 2:6-8). There is an emphasis in the case of the younger men on the duty to show their works, their uncorruptness, their gravity, their sincerity, as if to say that there is a great need that they should openly demonstrate their faith to the public.

Widows (1 Tim. 5:3f) are to show piety at home. There seems to be a failure on the part of the children to show love to the elderly, and the Christian example of keeping parents (when aged) and caring for them needed emphasis. Widows are not to live in pleasure and are to remain blameless.

The summary of the family ethic is found in Titus 2:12, where all are asked to live soberly, righteously and piously. The family is to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts in this present world. They are to take the lead in honorable occupations (Tit. 3:14) and exhibit the beauty of holiness and be zealous for good works (Tit. 2:14).

There is an ethic of punishment and reward in the Pastorals. The kind of religion or piety envisaged by the author suggests that it is profitable to live a Christian life (1 Tim. 4:8). Goguel implies that this piety is not exempt from a utilitarian element.[1] If Timothy obeys the instructions received by him, he will save himself and those who listen to him. The passage is not saying that to practice certain religious rites will bring an individual unlimited benefits here and hereafter.[2] But the passage does suggest hope in God (1 Tim. 4:10), which arises out of his saving power, and not man's piety.

The mention of a promise in the New Testament, usually refers to a promise from scripture.[3] Therefore, the author may be thinking of Old Testament passages in which life is said to be the reward of righteousness. Religion gives a fuller meaning to the present life, as well as the hereafter. Instead of

---

[1] Goguel, op. cit., (PC), p. 482.
[2] Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 69.
[3] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 40.

riches, which will lead to perdition, the man of God will obtain righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience and gentleness in the hour of decision. The reward or promise of life, sums up the blessedness of godliness.

Timothy is charged to keep the commandment unstained and free from reproach (1 Tim. 6:14). He is entrusted with a message,[1] and judgement upon him and those who listen will be determined by what he does with it. The punishment and reward are the result of a godly or ungodly life lived by the individual. He becomes his own judge by how he carries that commandment entrusted to him.

2 Timothy indicates a plan for law within the Christian ethic (2 Tim. 2:3-6). The moral life is compared to the life of a soldier, an athlete and a farmer. The life of these individuals has a clearly defined framework and direction which can only exist within laws. This life comes from God but is also grounded in the very nature of things. The life of the soldier is compared to the moral life. The soldier has the responsibility of keeping himself free from civil interests and of pleasing those who enrolled him. Then the athlete is told that he will not receive the crown if he fails to compete according to the rules. The last analogy is the farmer; he must work before he gathers. All three represent a relationship between the individual and his task. The ethic of law will dictate life for each. If the soldier involves himself in civil interests, he may be failing to do his service as a soldier. If an athlete does not compete in the games according to the rules, he cannot be crowned. And if the farmer fails to work his hardest, he does not deserve the first share of the crop.

A slave ethic can be drawn from 1 Timothy 6:1-2 and Titus 2:9-10. The author of the Pastorals enjoins obedience and willing service. He adds that

---

[1] Dibelius, op. cit., (P), p. 55; says the message entrusted to Timothy refers to all that has been entrusted to him. There is disagreement though: Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 115; says it refers to his baptismal commission; Parry, op. cit, p. 43; and Lock, op. cit, p. 72; and Kelly, op. cit, (C), p. 144. One needs to note that this 'commandment' could very easily have been at baptism, but also referring to all that has been entrusted to Timothy.

slaves who are Christians are to count their masters worthy of all honor that the name of God and the doctrine be not blasphemed. This is to be so even if the masters are heathen. But when their masters are believers, the slaves are to regard them as brothers, not despising the masters because of their position, but serving them, because they are all equal sharers of spirtual blessings. There must have been a danger that when a slave became a Christian and was treated by a Christian master with brotherliness, that "rebound from grovelling fear to terms of equality and affection would prove too much for him, and contempt might take the place of respectful loyalty."[1]

The obligation of the slave has been truned into a high and splendid task, and the author of these epistles does not confine this obligation to the negative attitude of obedience to their masters and fidelity in their work. Instead the slave has a special obligation to express the faith without relaxing in obedience or seeking emancipation from his present condition. A slave is to "adorn the doctrine of the God" (Tit. 2:10) in all things, and what finer witness to the gospel than this? Origen implied that it was not an uncommon thing to see families converted through the instrumentality of their slaves.[2] In other words, the slave's behavior will honor the Christian message and commend it to the outside world.

The ethic for the rich is given in 1 Timothy 6:17-19. The verses seem out of place and certainly do not follow what precedes them.[3] If we go back to

---

[1]Alexander, op. cit., (EP), p. 303.
[2]Plummer, op. cit., p. 256; quotes Origen, Migne Series Graeca, xi, 476, 482.
[3]Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 88; says these verses connect with verse 6:3-10, especially 6-10; but Falconer, op. cit., p. 158f; disagrees, and says that these verses seem to be an addition from a different source from that in 6:6-10. "Nothing is said here of the love of money (6:9-10), not are the rich denounced as in James 5:1-6. The thought is based on the Gospels, especially Luke, and its source may be in the circle Luke-Acts. It is more Christian than that of 6:6-10."

6:6-10, there is a connection. These verses (6-10) speak of finding contentment in godliness and not in worldly things. The author warns those who desire to be rich, because they will probably fall into temptation and may have senseless and hurtful desires: "for the love of money is the root of all evils" (6:10a). The author says it is through such cravings that men have wandered away from the faith, "and pierced their hearts with many pangs" (6:10b). To be rich, therefore, is a dangerous state. There must be better possessions than material wealth for true riches to exist.

At this point verses 17-19 become important as to an ethic for the wealthy. The previous passage (6:6-10) deals with those aspiring to be rich; this passage (17-19) deals with those who are already rich.[1] There is no suggestion of denunciation. The wealthy are to avoid certain perils. First, they are not to be haughty (or highminded). To the Greek, this was a term of praise; but in Christian language, it is a term of reproach.[2] The rich are not to throw their weight around; they are to use their affluence to be helpful and generous. Secondly, the rich are not to set their hopes on uncertain riches, such as the worldly goods, but on God. They are to look to God, not to mere possessions.

The wealthy are to do good and to be "rich in good deeds" (6:18). If the wealthy are to live rightly, their hopes must be based on the living God, who richly provides us with all the joys of life. Earthly things are given by God, who means them to be enjoyed. Therefore, the ascetic idea of this world as intrinsically evil is again condemned. The wealthy are to be liberal and generous (6:18). Liberal describes the act of giving, and generous (literally, ready to share), lays stress on the human sympathy which ought to accompany

---

[1] Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 117.
[2] Lock, op. cit., p. 74.

the gift.[1] If the rich act like this, then they lay up for themselves a good foundation for the future life.

An interesting Rabbinic example is quoted from the life of Monobaz, who shared all his wealth and the wealth of his fathers on alms in time of famine.[2] His brethren gathered round him and said:

> "Thy fathers laid up the treasure and added to their fathers's store, and dost thou waste it all? He answered, 'My father laid up treasure below; I have laid it up above .... My father laid up treasure to Mammon; I have laid up treasure of the souls .... My father laid up treasure for this world, I have laid up treasure for the world to come."

Echoes of the gospel appear in the ethic for the rich also. The sayings of the Lord who declared that a man's life does not consist of an abundance of possessions (Lk. 12:15) is echoed here in the Pastorals. Echoes of the parable of the rich fool are heard (Lk. 12:21). Therefore, the true life is a life that is in the future, yet can be lived now, and is the only life worthy of His name. By sharing, a man gains such a life, not by amassing material wealth.

The social ethic has a place in these epistles also. The duty to oneself is quite evident. Part of this ethic has been expressed in the leadership ethic (1 Tim. 3:1-8, 3:8-13, 5:17-22; Tit. 1:5-9) and the family ethic (1 Tim. 5:3-16, 2:11-15). The character of man is one of sincerity, a good conscience and a pure heart. He should model himself on the divine qualities of goodness and loving kindness (Tit. 3:4). He should have his passions under control, and be content with little (1 Tim. 6:7-8). There is a religious dignity that marks the Christian in the Pastorals. His ideal is to live a quiet and peaceful life in a religious and serious spirit (1 Tim. 2:2; 2 Tim. 2:22). Therefore, his virtues are kept healthy and free from feverish excitement (Tit. 2:2; 1 Tim. 6:4). This was man's duty toward himself.

---

[1] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 81.
[2] Lock, op. cit., p. 75.

Man's duty toward others involves being ready and prepared to serve. He is ready to be used by his Master, and he lives a life that is useful towards his fellowmen (1 Tim. 4:8; Tit. 3:4). If he has wealth, he is to be generous (1 Tim. 6:17-19). He is careful of justice to others; he is very gentle and forbearing in the face of opposition. This type of character is exhibited in the family (1 Tim. 3:5, 5:1), in a high conception of marriage (1 Tim. 2:15, 4:3, 5:14), and in faithfulness of master to slave (1 Tim. 6:1-2; Tit. 2:9-10).

Man's duty toward the state is to be exhibited in civic affairs (1 Tim. 2:2), and he is not to incur the charge of being a useless citizen (Tit. 3:1, 8, 14). The Christian is to pray for his rulers (1 Tim. 2:2), and be obedient to authority (Tit. 3:1). He has a responsibility to himself, to others, and to the state or those in authority.

What eventually emerges in these epistles is an ethic of moderation. The Christian leader is not told not to drink, but to drink moderately. He is reminded that he should not be a drunkard (1 Tim. 3:3), or addicted to much wine (1 Tim. 3:8). Even the older women are reminded in Titus 2:3 that they should not become slaves to drink. When someone is ill, he is encouraged to take a little wine (1 Tim. 5:23). The ethic is not puritanical but moderate towards drinking.

In the same vein the false teacher is to be avoided (1 Tim. 6:20; 2 Tim. 2:14, 2:16), not denounced. There is a sense of tolerance in the Pastorals towards these false teachers that Paul would not have had. The Lord's servant cannot afford to be quarrelsome, but kindly to every one (2 Tim. 2:25). He should correct his opponents with gentleness and example.

Wealth is not denounced either (1 Tim. 6:17). Even though the author says the love of money is the root of all evils, he does not condemn the rich. He warns them, but there is no suggestion of denunciation. The approach to the wealthy is strikingly moderate.

Women are encouraged to dress in a moderate way also. They are to adorn themselves modestly and sensibly, not with elaborate hairstyles or with gold or pearls (1 Tim. 2:10).

The balance of this ethic of moderation might lie in the term epieikes. The bishop and deacon must not let their passions loose while drinking. Both must rule in equity. They should show gentleness toward all men. All Christians should show gentleness and meekness in civic affairs also (Tit. 3:1f). And the one positive virtue midst negative ones is the virtue of gentleness (1 Tim. 3:3). The author offers a positive moderate approach under the circumstances. The ethic of moderation is evident. The denunciation ethic is not apparent. It is sobriety which guards a man from drinking excessively and from yielding to the pressure of worldly ease. And it is moderation that not only enjoins self-restraint in work, but care in regard to external apparel as consideration for others, and witness to the faith.

Our author, therefore, approaches all moral issues with a certain detachment. He considers deliberately how men ought to arrange and manage their lives. He is different from Paul, who relies on the simple direction of the Spirit. The Christian, to this author, is a loyal character showing love, endurance, kindness, gentleness, and is basically free from the grosser sins. This may be said to be common ground with the rest of the New Testament; but the Pastoral author emphasizes a new feature. This feature includes sobermindedness, gravity, and godliness. The Christian character is one of profound seriousness, and the virtue of joy is evidently missing.

One might even say that the author of these epistles seems to make this moral issue appear too serious. But when we look at the increase in laxity of morals during this period both among heathens and Christians, the answer is apparent. The author includes what is Christian, as well as what is prudent

and agreeable to custom. He recalls the moral standards of Paul to an age that is falling away from them, and adds to these standards precepts of a different order. The lax environment certainly created a serious, godly appeal, and the virtues incorporated by this author were most needed at the moment.

To place the Pastorals in their environment certainly demonstrates their relevancy to the period of history in which they were written. Lists of moral duties are laid down to distinguish the Christian from the pagan society.

The virtues acknowledged are universally practiced in the Hellenistic world. The author has borrowed freely from non-Christian lists of virtues and qualifications, and transformed them into a Christocentric exhortation.[1]

The church has become God's household (1 Tim. 3:15) - it is the pillar and bulwark of the truth. The family is God's family, and the individual within it has a responsibility of control that may determine his position in God's family.

Since the family was gravely threatened in the Graeco-Roman world, it was important that the Pastorals should emphasize that it is the hearth or center of godliness. Married life is to be held high and honorable, and children are to be kept under discipline in subjection with all gravity.

The Christian character is to be won by discipline and effort (1 Tim. 4:7b, 10), and progress in virtue should be manifest (4:15).[2] The author is making a serious appeal to his people - almost an over-emphasis. Godliness is dominant, even more so than faith.

The Christian has a grave responsibility to society also. This is a responsibility that involves civil authority, prayers for kings, and obeying the law. His whole life is one of sobermindedness, educated in righteousness and under the grace of God (Tit. 2:12). He is not to fight, but be gentle,

---

[1] Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 63.

[2] Falconer, op. cit., p. 38; tells us that this is similar to what was being taught in schools of philosophy.

apt to teach and forbearing (2 Tim. 2:24). By their life, the Christians are to commend the gospel (1 Tim. 4:12), showing themselves to be a pattern of good works (Tit. 2:7), and adorning the doctrine of God their Savior in all things (Tit. 2:10).

Christianity in the late first and early second century had to construct a formulation of it's faith in an academic as well as a spiritual realm. It had to offer solutions to the moral and intellectual needs of the day. Amidst all of this had to emerge a co-ordinated picture of the new life and new Christian experience.

Reasoning did not awaken the desire of man's mind as it had before with the leadership of the great philosophers. Therefore a strict rule of conduct was imposed upon the individual Christian. In order to penetrate the hearts of the pagan, Christianity had to establish itself once and for all as a hope for the people of that day.

Philosophical ideas could not be pushed aside. In fact "just because of the exclusive character of its claims, Christianity stood in special need of the services of philosophy."[1] Even though Clement said that the work of the Greeks was a "torn-off fragment of eternal truth," Christianity was "the genuinely true philosophy."[2] Other apologists followed and recognised the alliance of culture and faith.[3]

The church became authoritarian, and in turn a standardisation of morals and opinions crept in. The liberating faith of Christ became a sombre code of morals. Two positive moral factors emerged - one, was the development of the type of character that the Christian should be; and the other was

---

[1] Angus, op. cit., (RQ), p. 111.
[2] Angus, op. cit., (RQ), p. 111; quotes Clement, Strom. I, 13; viii, I.
[3] Angus, op. cit., (RQ), p. 111; "The great apologists recognised necessity of providing a philosophy or comprehensive theology of their faith intelligible to their day and of claiming an alliance of culture and faith, of a sincere devotion and the scientific spirit."

the example of the type of church that these people wanted.

The character is one of seriousness, sobermindedness, and godliness. The ideal is to live a quiet peaceable life (1 Tim. 2:2), prepared for service, gentle and forbearing in the face of opposition. The outward conduct of the Christian is very important. He has to win a good reputation.

His duty is to study, to show himself approved by God (2 Tim. 2:15) and exhibit Christianity in his family life. The household is a test for his capacity and leadership in the church (1 Tim. 3:5). The church is compared to the home in the Pastorals more than any other place in scripture. But it is not the church that is emphasized so much as it is the individual and his actions and behavior within the church - for the church is the household of God (1 Tim. 3:15).

The pagan is not attracted to home-life. To establish the church and compare it with the home is foreign to him. To state what place women should play as compared to how some women acted in this time is completely opposite of their previous role, which was low in honor and freedom. The Pastorals give womanhood a place, but make a point to say that is is a limited place (1 Tim. 2:11-12). A woman's role is lifted in the Christian community, and marriage becomes important, and contracted only once. While marriage was losing its sanctity in the pagan world, it was gaining stability in the Christian world.

Slavery was still universal, and the Pastorals react to it (Tit. 2:9-10). The Pastorals consider the slave a human being, whereas a slave was nothing more than a piece of property with no human rights in pagan society. In these epistles the slave still may not have human rights, but spiritual rights are his (Tit. 2:11). Slave labor diminished the demand to work in pagan society but in the Pastorals a man is encouraged and prepared for every good work, ready to be used by his Master at a moment's notice.

To be idle is a sin, for one is to work, show himself approved, suffer as a soldier (2 Tim. 2:3), compete according to the rules (2:5), struggle and work hard like the farmer (2:6). There is no time for idleness.

The era of the writing of the Pastorals was an arena of religious destitution. The Roman and the Greek kept adding to what they had, voluminous in size, poor in quality. Therefore, what Christianity brought had possibilities to the pagan, but it depended upon its strictness.

This new feature (compared to Paul) of the godly, sober, just, gentle, grave character is one of true and profound seriousness. This almost over-emphasis is certainly due to the laxity of the day. This prevailing laxity certainly created a compelling serious, godly appeal. These were the virtues most needed at the moment.

SECTION FIVE: THEOLOGY

The threatening danger of heresy within the early church was one of the reasons the Pastorals were written. Gnosticism[1] was one of the most potent operating forces in that environment. The terms Gnosticism and gnosis are derived from the word γνῶσις.[2] Gnosis means knowledge,[3] and the Gnostic

[1]G. van Groningen, First Century Gnosticism, (E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1967), p. 1; says "Gnosticism is generally used to refer to a religious movement, which was contemporaneous with early Christianity and which was considered to be a dangerous threat to the early Church." The term 'Gnostic' indicates the movement, and gnosis is employed to designate "intellectual knowledge as distinguished from the knowledge of faith or experience;" and R. M. Grant, Gnosticism and Early Christianity, (Columbia Un. Press, New York, 1959), p. 6f; Defining Gnosticism is an extraordinary difficult task,"since modern writers use the term to cover a wide variety of speculative religious phenomena ... yet there is something about all these systems which has made it possible for writers of ancient and modern to treat them together to call them Gnostic. The very word gnosis shows that the Gnostic 'knows.' He does not know because he has gradually learned; he knows because revelation has been given him;" and R. McL. Wilson, The Gnostic Problem, (A. R. Mowbray and Co., London, 1958), p. 65f; suggests great problems in terminology; "The title 'Gnostic' was originally claimed for themselves by certain particular groups, but in modern use it has been extended to the whole movement against which Irenaeus and others directed Refutations. In this sense, 'Gnosticism' is a general description of a series of related heretical schools which menaced the Church, particularly in the second century AD;" and Bigg, op. cit., (CT), p. 60; regards it as a phase of heathenism; and Bevan, op. cit., (HC), p. 90; "Christian Gnosticism, it is now recognised on all hands was not a wanton perversion, a wanton sophistication, of a clearly articulated orthodox theology, but an attempt made by men who had received the church's teaching when its intellectual expression was still more or less wavering and tentative, to combine that teaching with conceptions and aspirations prevalent in the Gentile world whence they had come."

[2]H. L. Mansel, The Gnostic Heresies of the First and Second Centuries, (John Murray, London, 1875), pp. 1-3; states that the meaning of the term Gnosis or Knowledge, as applied to a system of philosophy, may be illustrated by the language of Plato towards the end of the fifth book of the Republic, in which he distinguishes between 'knowledge' and 'opinion' as being concerned respectively with the 'real' and the 'apparent' ... we shall be justified in identifying 'knowledge' with that apprehension of things which penetrates beyond their sensible appearances to their essence and cause, and which differs in name only from that 'wisdom' which Aristotle tells us is by common consent admitted to consist in a knowledge of First Causes and Principles."

[3]Rudolf Sohm, Outlines of Church History, (MacMillan and Co., London, 1904), p. 27.

was the man[1] who possessed knowledge.[2]

Gnosticism was a contemporary of Christianity,[3] and a product of syncretism.[4] "It drew upon Jewish, pagan and Oriental sources of inspiration, and brought a distinctive attitude and certain characteristic ideas to the solution of the problem of evil and human destiny."[5]

Since Gnosticism was syncretistic, it is very difficult to define it. There is not one set of ideas that can be singled out as Gnostic; "rather it is a matter of a type of thought which manifests itself in different ways in different groups."[6] H. R. Mackintosh describes it as "an atmosphere rather than a system."[7]

---

[1] Hort, op. cit., (JC), p. 140; reminds us that γνωστικοί had historically a narrower application than Gnosis; and Foakes-Jackson, op. cit., (SLEC), p. 59; The term "applied to arrant impostors, who impressed their dupes by magic and fraud," and it was adopted by the true believer, "who saw below the system of Christian literalism."

[2] Foakes-Jackson, op. cit., (SLEC), p. 59; meant he had deeper spiritual perceptions.

[3] Wilson, op. cit., (GP), p. 68.

[4] Sheldon, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 194; and J. N. D. Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines, (Adam and Charles Black, London, 1958), p. 23; and Wilson, op. cit., (GP), p. 69; "The characteristic of Gnosticism in all its forms is syncretism, blending together elements of every sort, finding room for every type of thought, from the highest philosophical mysticism to the lowest form of magic;" and R. McL. Wilson, Gnosis and the New Testament, (Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1968), p. 6; says Gnosticism is fundamentally syncretistic, "welding into a synthesis elements from diverse cultures." He also quotes Hans Jonas, as saying that Gnosticism is not merely syncretism, or syncretism Gnosis; and Bultmann, op. cit., (T), p. 165; "The essence of Gnosticism does not lie in its syncretistic mythology but rather in a new meaning - new in the ancient world - of man and the world;" and van Unnik, op. cit., pp. 35-6; Gnosticism then is a product of this world of religious ideas and convictions, flowing and mingling together."

[5] Kelly, op. cit., (ECD), p. 23.

[6] Wilson, op. cit., (GP), p. 69.

[7] H. R. Mackintosh, The Person of Jesus Christ, (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1914), p. 134; and Hastings, op. cit., (E), p. 213f; and A. F. Pauly, Georg Wissowa, and Kroll, Real-Encyclopadie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, (Stuttgart), vol. 7, 1894.

Nevertheless, a very simplified account of Gnosticism is as follows. The basis of Gnosticism was dualism. Dualism claimed the spirit was good, and matter was altogether evil. If matter was evil, then God who is the pure Spirit cannot touch matter. He therefore has to put out a series of emanations, until you come to an emanation, who is the creator, the Demiurge - who is often identified with the God of the Old Testament. This has certain consequences. If matter was evil, the body was evil, and there could not be any such thing as a bodily resurrection. Further, if matter was evil, a man could adopt either asceticism or antinomianism. Asceticism kept the evil body down, and antinomianism believed that since the body was evil it did not matter what you did with it. As we study the Pastoral Epistles, we shall see these ideas emerging.

The Gnostic movement[1] was of great significance, in that it forced the Christian Church to determine and to define what its own beliefs were. By introducing a cosmogony and a theology which claimed to be compatible with the Christian religion, the Gnostic made it imperative for the leaders of Christian thought to face the problem of deciding what were the doctrines which were based upon Christian authority.

In the task of confuting these false doctrines and of defending the beliefs of the Christian Church, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria and Hippolytus took a leading part.

---

[1] I am saying 'Gnostic movement' in a very general way. Basically it was not an organised movement as such. Kelly, op. cit., (ECD), p. 25; says to speak of it as a movement suggests a concrete organization or church.

Speaking of the rule of truth, and of holding fast to it, Irenaeus said:

> "Holding, therefore, this rule we shall easily show, notwithstanding the great variety and multitude of their opinions, that these men have deviated from the truth ... by their pernicious doctrines, they change this truth into error ... Moreover they despise the workmanship of God, speaking against their own salvation, becoming their own bitterest accusers, and being false witnesses against themselves."[1]

Irenaeus defined the doctrines and practices of the heretical groups,[2] and revealed the absurdity of their belief.[3] He emphasized that "created things" were not the images of the Aeons,[4] or the shadow of the Pleroma,[5] but were created by the one Creator.[6]

After this, Irenaeus refuted the false interpretation of scripture which these Gnostics adduced in support of their theories.[7] The third book spoke of the validity of scripture, and the fourth book refuted the false teachings of Marcion.[8]

Tertullian, like Irenaeus, appealed to the unity and character of the early church's teaching. His five books against Marcion were the most important of Tertullian's anti-Gnostic writings. He refuted Marcion's distinction between the Supreme God and the Creator of the Universe,[9] and proceeded to show that the appearances of evil in the world were not inconsistent with the perfect goodness of its Author.[10] Marcion believed further that Christ was not

---

[1] A. Roberts and W. H. Rambaut, The Writings of Irenaeus, (Adv. Haer.), (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1868), p. 85.
[2] Ibid., (1:23-31), pp. 86f.
[3] Roberts and Rambaut, op. cit., (Iren., Adv. Haer., 2:4), p. 125.
[4] Roberts and Rambaut, op. cit., (Iren., Adv. Haer., 2:7), p. 134.
[5] Roberts and Rambaut, op. cit., (Iren., Adv. Haer., 2:8), p. 140.
[6] Roberts and Rambaut, op. cit., (Iren., Adv. Haer., 2:9), p. 142.
[7] Roberts and Rambaut, op. cit., (Iren., Adv. Haer., 2:20-23), p. 190f.
[8] Roberts and Rambaut, op. cit., (Iren., Adv. Haer., 4:8-11), p. 396f.
[9] Peter Holmes, Tertullian Against Marcion, (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1868), p. 1f.
[10] Ibid., p. 60f.

sent by the Creator of the world, but by the Supreme God to counteract the work of the Creator.[1] Marcion's Antitheses was also argued against by Tertullian:

> "To encourage a belief of this Gospel he has actually devised for it a sort of power, in a work composed of contrary statements set in opposition, thence entitled Antitheses, and compiled with a view to such a severance of the law from the gospel as should divide the Deity into two, nay, diverse, gods - one for each instrument, or Testament as it is more usual to call it."[2]

The Christian philosopher of the period,[3] Clement of Alexandria, also fought Gnostic thought. Like Irenaeus and Tertullian, Clement found himself confronting a rival teaching so varied, so diffused, so subtle, that it was as difficult a task to attack as it was dangerous to leave unchallenged.[4] Speaking of the Gnostic he wrote:

> "For we must never, as do those who follow the heresies, adulterate the truth, or steal the canon of the church, by gratifying our own lusts and vanity, by defrauding our neighbors; whom above all it is our duty, in the exercise of love to them, to teach to adhere to the truth ... those who speak treacherously with their tongues have the penalties that are on record."[5]

Clement's direct refutation of portions of Gnostic teaching was directed mainly to moral and practical questions. "The general principles of the Gnostic theories he does not attack directly, but refutes them indirectly by his counter-sketch of the true Gnostic, or perfect Christian."[6]

---

[1] Holmes, op. cit., (Ter.), p. 118f.
[2] Holmes, op. cit., (Ter.), p. 175-6.
[3] Mansel, op. cit., p. 260.
[4] R. B. Tollington, Clement of Alexandria, (Williams and Norgate, London, 1914), p. 45.
[5] William Wilson, The Writings of Clement of Alexandria, (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1869), p. 485.
[6] Mansel, op. cit., p. 270.

Hippolytus pursued a different method from the previous heresy fighters. The value of his work was historical. He stood for unadulterated truth:

> "And my exhortation to you is, do not devote attention to the fallacies of artificial discourses, nor the vain promises of plagiarizing heretics, but to the venerable simplicity of unassuming truth."[1]

"Hippolytus ascended to the origin of heresy, not only in assigning herterdoxy a derivative nature from heathenism, but in pointing out in the Gnosis elements of abnormal opinions antecedent to the promulgation of Christianity."[2] We therefore have a most interesting account of the heresies with a strong defence in the simplicity of unassuming truth.

It is only possible to speculate what caused such a syncretistic system of thought as Gnosticism. One of the operative thoughts giving rise to Gnosticism was the spirit of intellectual aristocracy which dominated the ancient world. "Priesthoods and philosophers embraced the theory that the great mass of men were without capacity for the higher grades of religious as well as of secular knowledge."[3] These men of knowledge supposedly had grasped Christianity in its transcendent significance. "The tendency of Gnosticism," said de Pressense, "is always to make the element of knowledge predominate over that of the moral life; it changes religion into theosophy."[4]

Much in Gnostic theology went back into Hellenistic thought.[5] As has been stated, it was not just a depraved form of Christianity,[6] but it arose partly out of the attempt to express Christianity in Hellenistic terms.[7]

---

[1] J. H. MacMahon, The Refutation of all Heresies by Hippolytus, (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1868), p. 401.
[2] Ibid., p. 21.
[3] Sheldon, op. cit., p. 201.
[4] Sheldon, op. cit., p. 202; quotes de Pressense, Heresy and Christian Doctrine, Book I, chapter 1.
[5] Wilson, op. cit., (GP), p. 68.
[6] Bevan, op. cit., (HC), p. 90.
[7] Wilson, op. cit., (GP), p. 68; reminds us that this occurred without the safeguards which Paul and his fellow-laborers imposed upon their work."

Another factor was the spirit of Oriental pagan mysticism.[1] The Oriental mind expressed itself best in the allegorical, mystical, and vague way that Gnosticism bred. Gnosticism drew upon this source of inspiration and brought a distinctive attitude and even certain characteristic ideas to its solution of the problem of evil and human destiny.[2]

Dualism was another originating cause that gave rise to Gnosticism. Dualism was a painful consciousness of the might of evil which struggles in this world for mastery over the good.[3] This dualistic view of the time became dominant in Gnosticism,[4] setting an infinite chasm between the spiritual world and the world of matter, which was regarded as evil.[5]

The originating causes of Gnosticism created many varied systems. Systems ascribed to Simon Magus, Menander, and Saturninus were the oldest, according to Irenaeus.[6] These three constituted the basis of the Syrian Gnosis.

Simon Magus was a magician, who practiced magic in Samaria,[7] and became a great figure to the people. "This man is that power of God which is called Great," says the New Testament.[8] There is a question as to whether he was Gnostic before he came into contact with Christianity, but the evidence is inadequate.[9]

According to another account given by Irenaeus, Simon was said to have spoken of himself as having appeared to the Jews as the Son, to the Samaritans

---

[1] Bultmann, op. cit., (PC), p. 63; and van Groningen, op. cit., p. 12; and Sheldon, op. cit., p. 203.
[2] Kelly, op. cit., (ECD), p. 23.
[3] Sheldon, op. cit., p. 203.
[4] Grant, op. cit., (GEC), p. 112f.
[5] Kelly, op. cit., (ECD), p. 26.
[6] Roberts and Rambaut, op. cit., (Iren., Adv. Haer., 1:23-24), p. 86f.
[7] Acts 8:9.
[8] Acts 8:10b.
[9] Wilson, op. cit., (GP), p. 99; states that Haenchen makes this assumption, but Wilson says it falls short at the crucial point. He quotes Cerfaux's idea that the Simonian theory was a gnosis, and pagan, before Simon's contact with the Christian message, but it was not specifically a Gnosticism. Also Quispel is quoted - questioning whether Simon himself was fully a Gnostic, "although the Simonian system is certainly the earliest known form of Gnostic heresy."

as the Father, and to the Gentiles as the Holy Spirit.[1] For Simon, the world was created by angels (archangels, exousiai),[2] who had been generated by a first Thought. This Thought was Simon's companion, Helen. She was supposedly the first conception of his mind, emanating from him as Athena from the head of Zeus.[3] She "descended to lower regions and generated angels and powers, by whom this world was made."[4]

The angels misgoverned the world,[5] and Simon came for the reformation - appearing like a man, but not a man.[6] The prophets were inspired by these lesser angels,[7] therefore no one was to pay attention to them. One was saved by grace not by works.[8] Therefore, Irenaeus said that Simon promised that the world should be released and those who were his, set free.[9]

As one can easily see, the system was an assimilation of imperfectly understood Christian doctrines to certain pagan philosophic ideas.[10] This line of

---

[1] Roberts and Rambaut, op. cit., (Iren., Adv. Haer., 1:23), p. 86f.
[2] Grant, op. cit., (GEC), p. 15.
[3] Roberts and Rambaut, op. cit., (Iren., Adv. Haer., 1:16), p. 69f.
[4] Wilson, op. cit., (GP), p. 100.
[5] Mansel., op. cit., p. 83.
[6] Grant, op. cit., (G), p. 28; "The pictures of Simon's descent closely resembles what is said of the Savior-Christ in other gnostic systems and of Jesus Christ in such relative 'orthodox' documents as the Ascension of Isaiah and the Epistle of the Apostles. It seems to combine the Christian idea of the coming and ascension of Jesus with the gnostic picture of hostile planetary angels through which the Savior must somehow pass."
[7] Wilson, op. cit., (GP), p. 100.
[8] Mansel, op. cit., p. 84; and Wilson, op. cit., (GP), p. 100.
[9] Roberts and Rambaut, op. cit., (Iren., Adv. Haer., 1:23), p. 86f.
[10] Wilson, op. cit., (GP), p. 100f; "Something is due to Stoicism, something to the Orient, something to Christianity, but the Christian elements play a relatively small part. Several features of later Gnostic thought are already present, such as the conception of emanations, the idea of the world is the creation of inferior powers, and that there is in it an element of divine imprisoned and awaiting deliverance." Wilson continues in his footnote (p. 110), to state that Hippolytus therefore declares Valentinus drew the elements of his theory from that of Simon, although using a different terminology (Phil. 6:20). "Quispel (Gnosis, p. 51) notes that according to Irenaeus, Valentinus was dependent on the gnostics, who in turn were dependent on Simon. Cerfaux, on the other hand, claims that the Ophites and Sethians reflect Valentinian influences."

thought was carried on by Menander,[1] and Saturninus, with deviations.[2] Saturninus' greatest difference from Simon and Menander was his lack of a female principle. He advocated extreme asceticism,[3] for this was the path to emancipation.[4]

Thus Eusebius emphatically said:

> "Thus from Menander, whom we have already mentioned as the successor of Simon, there proceded a certain snakelike power with two mouths and double head, and established the leaders of two heresies, Saturninus, an Antiochian by race, and Basilides of Alexandria. The first established schools of impious heresy in Syria, the latter in Egypt."[5]

Others early sects included the Nicolaitans,[6] the followers of Cerinthus, and the Ophites. The Nicolaitans taught that fornication was a matter of indifference and that one should eat meats sacrificed to idols.[7] They also drew from the gospels conclusions which Paul had tried to combat in his letters.[8]

---

[1] Grant, op. cit., (G), p. 30; Simons successor, "a Samaritan who himself reached the pinacle of the art of magic."

[2] Grant, op. cit., (GEC), pp. 15-18; Some differences: All three say the world was created, not generated, but Simon and Menander speak of generation or emanation in the spiritual world, Saturninus retains the Jewish doctrine that the world was 'made, not begotten.' Also Simon and Saturninus state that Old Testament prophecies were inspired by the angels - Simon specifically says that they gave the Old Testament law, while Saturninus adds that some of the prophecies came from Satan. Also in Saturninus' system the Thought of Simon and Menander has been replaced by the spark of life given to good men; and Grant, op. cit., (G), p. 30; says Menander "added the gift of magical knowledge given in his teaching so that it might overcome the angels who made the world;" and G. A. Buttrick, The Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible, article by R. M. Grant, vol. 2, (Abingdon Press, New York, 1962), p. 404f; says Menander produced his own doctrine.

[3] Buttrick, op. cit., (D), p. 405; and Wilson, op. cit., (GP), p. 103; "The most striking novelty is the ascetic strain ... most of his predecessors apparently proclaimed an antinomian doctrine."

[4] Sheldon, op. cit., p. 217.

[5] Kirsop Lake, Eusebius (Ecc. Hist. iv. 7), (William Heinemann, London, 1926), p. 315.

[6] Grant, op. cit., (G), p. 43; "Actually there is no means clear that the Nicolans of Acts had anything to do with the Nicolaitans. The stories about Nicolans told by the later antiheretical writers look like legends, and Epiphanius' account of Nicolaitan doctrine and practice seems to be

Man was free, not under law as with Paul, but because his gnosis set him free.[1]

In Asia Cerinthus taught, according to Irenaeus, that the world was not made by the Supreme God, but by a certain power separate from this God (and one which was ignorant of the God who was over things). He said Jesus was born of Joseph and Mary, but distinguished from others by prudence, justice and wisdom.[2] He adhered in part to Judaism, says Epiphanius.[3]

The Ophite heresies first appearance was at the end of the first century.[4] Irenaeus gave us the description of their system.[5] They made the work of redemption begin with the creation of man. "The antagonism of a good and an evil principle, applied to the Mosaic narrative of the Creation and Fall," was the primary conception which underlies all their teaching.[6] The veneration of the serpent, from which their appelation as well as that of the Ophite generally was derived, was but the logical development of a theory, the "germ of which is common to many of the Gnostic sects." The serpent was the symbol of intellect (Iren. 1, 30, 5), by whose means the first human pair were raised to the knowledge of the existence of higher beings than their Creator.[7]

---

based partly on his own fertile imagination, and partly on what he knows about other groups."

[7]Grant, op. cit., (G), p. 43.

[8]Roberts and Rambaut, op. cit., (Iren., Adv. Haer. 1:23), p. 86f.

---

[1]Wilson, op. cit., (GP), p. 101; "... all religious rites can be transformed by him to the true worship - he knows the pagan gods are nothing, and may attend their rites without incurring any danger to himself."

[2]Roberts and Rambaut, op. cit., (Iren., Adv. Haer. 1:26), p. 97; and MacMahon, op. cit., (Hip. 7:33), p. 303f.

[3]Mansel, op. cit., p. 113.

[4]Mansel, op. cit., p. 104; quotes Baur, Das Christenthum der drei ersten Jahrh, 1853, p. 176; as saying that the oldest Gnostic sects do not bear the name of the individual founder, but only one representing Gnostic ideas, and specifies the Ophites as of this class.

[5]Roberts and Rambout, op. cit., (Iren., Adv. Haer. 1:28), p. 100.

[6]Mansel, op. cit., p. 103.

[7]Mansel, op. cit., p. 96.

Three Gnostic leaders of the second century were Marcion, Basilides and Valentinus. Marcion was a representative of Asiatic Gnosticism. He was a follower of Cerdo, who taught that the God who was proclaimed by the Law and the Prophets was not the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.[1]

Originally Marcion was a Christian, and this made him quite different from other Gnostics. He found the Old Testament impossible to reconcile with the gospel of Christ.[2] Marcion's dualism eventually led him to deny all doctrinal authority of the Old Testament.[3]

Marcion altered scripture,[4] which led him to reject a large portion of the New Testament.[5] Paul was his hero and sole authority.[6] Unlike his Syrian predecessors, he did not recognise any principle of pure evil. "He assumed only three principles: the Supreme God, the Demiurge, and the eternal matter. The latter two being imperfect, but not essentially evil."[7] Regarding the incarnation, he was a docetist.[8] Salvation only came to those who learned his doctrine.[9]

Basilides followed in the steps of Simon and Saturninus, his predecessors.[10] He taught in Alexandria at the time of Hadrian.[11] In his system[12] one met

---

[1] Mansel, op. cit., p. 203.
[2] Kelly, op. cit., (ECD), p. 57; and Mansel, op. cit., p. 204.
[3] Sheldon, op. cit., p. 217.
[4] Wilson, op. cit., (GP), p. 130; and Mansel, op. cit., p. 206; and Grant, op. cit., (G), p. 45.
[5] Mansel, op. cit., p. 206; He did this because he felt them to be corrupt when paralleled with the pure doctrines of Christianity.
[6] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 57; and Sheldon, op. cit., p. 217.
[7] Mansel, op. cit., p. 218; quotes Theodoret, Haer. Fab. i, 24; and states that Epiphanius, Haer. xlii, 3, mentions the Devil as a third principle added by Marcion to the two recognised by Cerdon, the Supreme God and the Demiurge.
[8] Sheldon, op. cit., p. 219; He taught that the bodily appearance of Christ was pure delusion; and he never came into contact with sinful matter.
[9] Grant, op. cit., (G), p. 46.
[10] Wilson, op. cit., (GP), p. 123.
[11] Lake, op. cit., (Eus, Ecc. Hist, iv, 7), p. 315.
[12] Roberts and Rambaut, op. cit., (Iren. Adv. Haer., 1:24), p. 89; and MacMahon, op. cit., (Hip. 7:20f), p. 304f; and Sheldon, op. cit., p. 212.

with the graded order of existence, that descended from the supreme.[1]

The transcendence of the primal Being was emphasized in his teaching.[2] Basilides' school employed magic, images, incantations, invocations, and similar curious and peculiar practices.[3] He rejected the attempt to account for the origin of evil, which was so common among Gnostics. He did it by the hypothesis of an eternal inert matter, or of a self existing, active, malignant principle.[4] Redemption came through Nous, the father's first-begotten,[5] and it was for the soul alone, since the body was by nature perishable.[6] "The system of Basilides is of all the Gnostic systems the one which least recognises any break or distinction between the Christian revelation and the other religions of the world, heathen or Jewish ... No place is left for the special providence of God, nor for the freewill of man."[7]

The Valentinian movement, unlike the Basilidian system, never ceased to be faithful to the distinctive Gnostic ideas, "and drew into itself practically the whole stream of later Gnosticism."[8] This Egyptian Gnosticism had its

---

[1] Kelly, op. cit., (ECD), p. 25.

[2] Sheldon, op. cit., p. 211f; This primal Being is declared "not only above all name and conception, but above the category of existence itself, identical with our thought with non-entity. In passing from the primal Being to the lower orders of existence, Basilides takes a somewhat unusual course from a Gnostic."

[3] Wilson, op. cit., (GP), p. 124; "They professed to give the names of angels in the several heavens, and claimed that only a few could know their secrets;" and Grant, op. cit., (G), p. 34.

[4] Mansel, op. cit., p. 149.

[5] Kelly, op. cit., (ECD), p. 25; and Wilson, op. cit., (GP), p. 124; "For salvation it was thus necessary to confess not the crucified but the incarnate Jesus who was thought to have been crucified; those who confessed the crucified were still slaves to the creator of the body, but those who denied him were freed. Salvation was of the soul alone, since the body was corruptible by nature."

[6] Grant, op. cit., (G), p. 34.

[7] Mansel, op. cit., pp. 164-5; and Wilson, op. cit., (GP), p. 127f; "The cardinal Gnostic positions had been gradually abandoned by the disciples of Basilides, and his gnosis merged itself at last in the ordinary philosophical speculations of the age."

[8] Wilson, op. cit., (GP), p. 128.

greatest popularity under Valentinus,[1] who presented his philosophy in the form of poetical personifications instead of metaphysical abstractions.[2] It was a system that was derived from many sources.[3]

Valentinus employed the term pleroma to designate the entire system of thirty aeons.[4] The pleroma was the region of light and spiritual fullness.[5] The work of redemption consisted in the communication of knowledge.[6] This was in strict accordance with the Gnostic doctrine.

This Valentinian theory represented Gnosticism at its prime.[8] It fell short of a true pantheistic goal. This might be regarded as a product of inconsistency rather than of strict adherence to the requirements of his premises.[9] The Valentinian school had many followers. Among the most distinguished were Ptolemy, Marcus and Heracleon.[10]

---

[1]Kelly, op. cit., (ECD), p. 23; "... taught at Alexandria, and later in Rome in the middle decades of the second century;" and Sheldon, op. cit., p. 213; says he was a native of Egypt and of Jewish descent.

[2]Mansel, op. cit., p. 166.

[3]Alfred Loisy, The Birth of the Christian Religion, (George Allen and Unwin, London, 1948), p. 307f; and Mansel, op. cit., p. 167f; suggests three sources; Platonic philosophy; pantheistic philosophy of India; and the Judaism of Alexandria (and perhaps the Persian religious philosophy).

[4]Kelly, op. cit., op. cit., p. 23; and Wilson, op. cit., (GP), p. 128f; and Sheldon, op. cit., p. 213f.

[5]Sheldon, op. cit., p. 214; and Kelly, op.cit., (C), p. 23; "The thirty form the pleroma, or fullness of the God-head, but the only begotten Nous alone possesses the possibility of knowing and revealing the Father."

[6]Mansel, op. cit., p. 179; and Sheldon, op. cit., p. 215; gives a full account of the consummation of redemption.

[7]H. C. Puech, G. Quispel, and W. C. van Unnik, The Jung Codex, (F. L. Cross, editor), (A. R. Mowbray, London, 1955), p. 98; compares the Gospel of Truth, to the ecclesiastical writers, and finds them 'wanting' on the account of the elaborate doctrine of aeons. He says the aeons play a different role. The 'primal sin' is defined differently and there is no mention of a Demiurge in contradistinction from the highest God.

[8]Wilson, op. cit., (GP), p. 133; "... with the ideas of the earlier thinkers blended into a system which could for a time compete seriously with orthodox Christianity. Allegorizations of Scripture, ideas from the religion and philosophy of the contemporary world, astrology, magic, all made some contribution."

Because of the diversity of the many Gnostic systems it is quite difficult to find consistent features which occurred in each one, but it is necessary to set out the common elements as far as we can.

First, Gnosticism was a religion of saving knowledge.[1] This knowledge was essentially self-knowledge; "recognition of the divine element which constitutes the true self."[2] For Simon Magus, Helen was redeemed; for Saturninus, the essence of man was the divine spark of life from the unknown God; for Basilides, the Ophites, and Valentinus, the work of Nous (Christ) was to rescue people from the world below. Redemption was to be brought about by knowledge.[3]

From this, a variety of myths and cultic practices grew. A practice of a rigid asceticism followed for many. Mythology became images rather than pure conceptions.[4]

Freedom became the aim of Gnosticism. "Gnostics were ultimately devoted to freedom not to mythology."[5] Speculation and mythology were ways to this freedom. As the Gospel of Truth said:

> "Therefore he who knows is being from above. If he is invoked, he understands, he replies, he turns to him who invokes him; he comes back to, understands how he is invoked. Possessing Gnosis, he carries out the will of him who has called him and desires to do what pleases him. He receives rest ... He who thus possesses knowledge knows whence he has come and whether he goes. He understands like a man who frees himself and awakens from the drunkenness in which he was, returning to himself."[6]

---

[9]Sheldon, op. cit., p. 216; and Mansel, op. cit., p. 194; "As the thought which underlies his whole theory is substantially that of the Indian pantheism, according to which all finite existence is an error and an unreality, so his scheme of redemption logically carried out should have resulted in the abortion of all finite and relative existence into the bosom of the infinite and absolute."

[10]Kelly, op. cit., (ECD), p. 25; and Sheldon, op. cit., p. 216.

---

[1]MacGregor, and Purdy, op. cit., p. 313; and Grant, op. cit., (GEC), p. 10f.

Speculative dualism was an important element in Gnosticism.[1] It pointed to the material and physical as evil, and the spiritual as good.[2] As Jonas has stated, this dualism governed the relation of God and the world, and man and the world:

> "The deity is absolutely transmundane, its nature alien to that of the universe, which it neither created nor governs and to which it is the complete antithesis: to the divine realm of light, self-contained and remote, the cosmos is opposed as the realm of darkness. The world is the work of lowly powers which though they may immediately be descended from Him do not know the true God and obstruct the knowledge of Him in the cosmos over which they rule."[3]

The development of dualism is set forth by K. G. Kuhn, in which he identifies certain specific elements.[4] In brief the three elements are:

1) Judaism based on the Old Testament,
2) Iranian dualism, and
3) Greek thought which also verges on dualism.

This dualism was a long way from any form of Judaism, and was basically anti-Semitic. What seemed to have happened was that the movement that may well have begun in Judaism, or in reaction to apocalyptic Judaism, soon attracted adherents who were Gentiles.[5] This kind of gnosis began possibly in Judaism but ended in the world of Graeco-Roman syncretism.[6]

---

[2]Grant, op. cit., (GEC), p. 10.
[3]Kelly, op. cit., (ECD), p. 26; quotes Irenaeus (Adv. Haer. 1:21)
[4]Sheldon, op. cit., p. 206; quotes Irenaeus (Adv. Haer. 4:1).
[5]Grant, op. cit., (GEC), p. 12; and Kelly, op. cit., (ECD), p. 26.
[6]Puech, op. cit., p. 30.

---

[1]Hort, op. cit., p. 143; says a speculative dualism is an important element both of Judaism and of other speculative systems; and Jonas, op. cit., p. 42; says its a cardinal feature of Gnosticism.
[2]van Groningen, op. cit., p. 30; says it is different here from Christianity because it does not identify evil with the material and good with the spiritual. Gnosticism is thus fundamentally different from Christianity and Judaism. He also notes on p. 55, that gnostic dualism is fundamentally different from apocalyptic dualism.
[3]Jonas, op. cit., p. 42.
[4]K. G. Kuhn, "Die Sektenschrift und die Iranische Religion," Zeitschrift fur

Bultmann would say that Gnosticism was a redemption religion based on dualism.[1] Possibly this was an oversimplification of the problem.[2] At any rate, dualism was an important (if not the most important) feature of Gnosticism. As W. D. Niven has said: "It is the foundation principle of all Gnostic systems; from it everything else follows."[3]

Another feature was the division of the universe into many levels. The material was the seat of evil, and the Savior came from the Aeonic world.[4] Some say that much of the Gnostic theology came directly from Stoic systems of thought.[5]

As has been previously stated, Gnosticism may well have Jewish roots. In fact there is much to suggest a Jewish origin.[6] Judaism was probably a contributing source to the origin and development of Gnosticism.[7] There are many

---

Theologie und Kirche, XLIX, 1952, p. 315.

[5] Grant, op. cit., (GEC), p. 118.

[6] Grant, op. cit., (GEC), p. 118; says certainly with the Nassenes we are well beyond Judaism. He refers us to J. Carcopino, De Pythagore aux apotres, Paris, 1956, pp. 175-188.

---

[1] Bultmann, op. cit., (PC), p. 63.

[2] van Groningen, op. cit., p. 2; states that this serves Bultmann, but it does not serve the student who takes the entire range of evidences into account as he studies Gnosticism.

[3] W. D. Niven, The Conflicts of the Early Church, (Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1930), p. 153.

[4] Sheldon, op. cit., p. 205.

[5] Wilson, op. cit., (GP), p. 104; Posidonius is cited as an example "but for the Logos which orders the material world, Gnosticism, with a stronger sense of the evil of the material substitutes a fall of a spiritual being into matter, symbolized by the fall of Adam."

[6] Mgr. L. Duchesne, Early History of the Christian Church, (John Murray, London, 1909), vol. 1, p. 61; says that heresy in these remote days springs from Jewish or Mosaic root; and Wilson, op. cit., (GP), p. 97; Even though he suggests this, he warns us that, "this is not to say that we may simply identify Gnosticism with Jewish heterdoxy, since other factors have clearly played their part;" and Grant, op. cit., (GEC), p. 26; says this also and states that none of the Gnostic leaders that we know though, have Jewish names; yet, Jean Doresse, The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics, (Hollis and Carter, London, 1960), p. 289; warns us that one must limit himself to listing the principal features that connect our Gnostic myths with Judaism.

parallels between Judaism and Gnosticism.

1) Both maintain the transcendence of God.
2) Both interpose one or more intermediaries between Him and the world.
3) The Gnostic aeons and emanations are parallel to the Jewish angels and Philonic Logos and powers.
4) Both accept the Hellenistic cosmogony, with its astrological associations.
5) There is a parallel in Gnosticism to Philo's account of the creation of man.
6) There is a parallel between the rebellion of the powers against Ialabaoth (Ophite system) and the Jewish theory of a conflict among angels on behalf of the nations.
7) Also the union of the angels with Achamoth is based on an Old Testament narrative.
8) Valentinian's concept of the final union of the elect soul with its divine counterpart, parallels in Philo.
9) Also the conception of the Spirit as a female power seems only possible under Semitic influence, since the Hebrew ruah is feminine, while the Greek πνεῦμα is neuter.[1]

Judaism's contribution to Gnosticism had a direct and an indirect impact. It was direct through the absorption of Jewish ideas into Gnostic thought, but also in part indirect, since it was through the medium of Jewish speculation that certain pagan elements came into Gnosticism.[2] Therefore, one can easily conclude that Judaism was probably the most likely and fertile source of Gnosticism.[3] It is questionable though as to which area of Judaism had the most influence.

---

[7]Grant, op. cit., (GEC), p. 39; is committed to the idea that Gnosticism originated out of apocalyptic Judaism; and Wilson, op. cit., (GP), pp. 173f; "This, however, is only a provisional judgement, which must be checked and where necessary modified by further and more detailed examination of certain special aspects."

---

[1]Wilson, op. cit., (GP), p. 172; and Grant, (GEC), op. cit., p. 39
[2]Wilson, op. cit., (GP), p. 182.
[3]van Groningen, op. cit., p. 10; feels that this was the Judaism of the Diaspora, in particular; and Bultmann, op. cit., (T), vol. 1, pp. 170-1; states that the Diaspora Judaism was a channel for Gnosticism to develop; and Grant, op. cit., (GRC), p. 39; feels that Gnosticism orginated from apocalyptic Judaism.

Gnostic roots in the New Testament are not as clearly defined as they seem to be in Judaism. The fear is hypostatizing certain ill-defined tendencies of thought and then speaking as if they constituted a defined religion, or philosophy.[1] My objective is to identify areas in which an incipient Gnosticism may, with some confidence, be detected in the background of certain New Testament books.

To speak of gnosis in the New Testament is to assume that there was such a thing, and it did exist. Therefore, it is important that I make an early clarification. Within the pages of the New Testament there are influences that seem to fall under the terminology of Gnosticism (in general). Many scholars find gnostic influences in quite a few New Testament books, even though there is great debate on this subject. My personal thesis is that there is ground to stand on if one feels this way.

It would be safer to imply that there existed feelings and thought of a gnostic origin rather than to speak of Gnosticism as an organized body in the first century. Even though this will not be an exhaustive study of gnosis in the New Testament,[2] it will show that many feel that this gnosis did have a footing at the time of Paul and following his death. The New Testament reveals a variety of response and reaction to what appears to be some type of gnostic movement.

---

[1] Alan Richardson, An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament, (SCM Press, London, 1958), pp. 41-2; states that Bultmann is "question-begging" when he describes a Gnostic doctrine from the first century evidence of the New Testament ... "Since the New Testament is susceptible of a very different interpretation; if there is no real evidence for a developed Gnosticism, in the first century outside the New Testament, then the New Testament can hardly be used as evidence for its existence;" yet, Bultmann, op. cit., (T), vol. 1, p. 164f; lists "Gnostic Motifs," and in his Primitive Christianity, p. 190, he lists a number of terms which he affirms are mythological and derived from Gnosticism.

[2] Wilson, op. cit., (GNT), chapter two; deals with this subject thoroughly.

There are many books in the New Testament that do not seem to have any traces of gnostic thought. The letters to Thessalonica or Philippi do not demand a gnostic explanation. Nor do James and 1 Peter demand such an explanation; Galatians might, but probably not.[1]

In the Corinthian letters there are certain indications of gnostic opponents. These letters probably show the earliest use of the word gnosis (1 Cor. 8:1) in a depreciatory sense,[2] and warrant us with some probability in interpreting the term as it is used later quite often. But, it does not allow us to state that all that is said was gnostic.[3] In 1 Corinthians we encounter the mysterious archons, but in 2 Corinthians the mythological background of Paul's thought becomes clear. Paul stood between Jewish apocalyptic thought and developed Gnosticism.[4]

Ephesus and Colossae were two chief centers of gnostic influence, both regard philosophical teaching and practical addiction to magic.[5] Although some disagree,[6] it is highly probable that gnostic influence is to be found in these epistles. Ephesians speaks of love which passes knowledge (3:19), and reminds us of the contrast between knowledge and love. The use of the term pleroma suggests gnostic thought (Eph. 1:23, 4:13) also. More distinct illustrations

---

[1] Wilson, op. cit., (GNT), p. 58; says "Galatians shows some vague traces of the kind of thinking later characteristic of Gnosticism," but this may be something else also; and E. Burton, Galatians, (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1921), pp. 426f; says in one passage (1:4), there is a link with Jewish apocalyptic rather than with Gnosticism; and Grant, op. cit., (GEC), p. 156.

[2] Mansel, op. cit., p. 50.

[3] W. Schmithals, Die Gnosis in Korinth, Gottingen, 1956.

[4] Grant, op. cit., (GEC), p. 157.

[5] E. Burton, The Heresies of the Apostolic Age, (Oxford, 1829), p. 83.

[6] A. S. Peake, Expositor's Greek Testament, (iii, London), p. 484f; and Ernst Percy, Probleme der Kolosser und Epheserbriefe, (Lund, 1946), pp. 176f.

are found in Colossians. This false teaching seems to have manifested itself in the form of a combination of Judaism with Gnosticism.[1] They believed in a fullness of divine being made of the angels, and that they were to accept the Jewish law and certain ascetic requirements (Col. 2:16, 21). The people of Colossae also spoke of a certain kind of knowledge (epignosis) of God (1:9-10, 2:2).[2]

The Synoptic Gospels show us almost nothing which seems to be related to Gnosticism.[3] Haenchen finds but one echo, the famous 'Johannine thunderbolt' in Matthew 11:27 and its Lucan parallel.[4]

> "All things have been delivered to me by my Father; and no one knows the Son except the Father, and no one knows the Father except the Son and any one to whom the Son chooses to reveal him."

The fact that the Synoptics later provided the material for much gnostic speculation does not make them gnostic. Luke had recent work done on it concerning a possible gnostic link.[5] But it is certainly a mistake to narrow Luke's aim to a single purpose.[6]

Concerning the gospel of John there are many theories as to its gnostic influence. There was some relationship, but exactly what it was is questionable.[7] If some of the orthodox theologians of the past, like Clement of Alexandria and Origen on the one hand and Hellenistic Jews like Philo on the other should

---

[1] Mansel, op. cit., p. 53.
[2] Grant, op. cit., (GEC), pp. 158-9; and G. Bornkamm, Das Ende des Gesetzes, (Gottingen, 1956), p. 139 f.
[3] Grant, op. cit., (GEC), p. 152; "Some Gnostics were able to find support for their views by allegorical interpretation of the sayings of Jesus or, at times, by noncontextual literal exegesis."
[4] Wilson, op. cit., (GNT), p. 44; refers to Haenchen.
[5] C. H. Talbert, Luke and the Gnostics, (Nashville, 1966); but Kummel, op. cit., p. 114.
[6] Wilson, op. cit., (GNT), p. 45.
[7] C. K. Barrett, Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation, (Klassen and Snyder, editors), (London, 1962), p. 210.

be called gnostics, then Dodd feels John could have a gnostic author;[1] and Bultmann says some of John's concepts came from gnostic dualism, and this dualism was that of Gnosticism.[2] Against the background of gnostic dualism the gospel of John shows at every crucial point that it was in tension with the gnostic point of view.[3] But one has to remember that gnostic use of a document does not make the document itself gnostic. Even the comparison of theological vocabulary of John and the Gospel of Truth show differences.[4] Therefore, to say that John is gnostic, is risky; but to say that there are certain affinities and relationships that are difficult to define is safe.[5]

It is fairly clear that an incipient Gnosticism was combatted in 1 John. The key-notes are the Docetic Christology, "denying that Jesus is in the flesh (4:2), ... perhaps also denying the crucifixion (5:6), ... and certain indifference to morality in matters of conduct." Even though we cannot place the heresy noted in 1 John with a known gnostic group,[6] it probably was close to the teaching of Cerinthus.[7]

Jude, like the Pastorals, denounced ungodly people for their teaching, but did not define this type of person or their teaching. There may be a reference to the gnostic sect of the Nicolaitans, mentioned by name in Revelation.[8] Two great errors that characterised Gnosticism from the beginning, are alluded to

---

[1] C. H. Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, (Cambridge Un. Press, 1953), p. 97; and F. C. Grant, The Gospels: Their Origin and Growth, (Faber and Faber, London, 1959), p. 160; feels that this author (in John) could have been a converted gnostic.

[2] Bultmann, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 17.

[3] Stephen Neill, The Interpretation of the New Testament, 1861-1961, (Oxford Un. Press, London, 1964), p. 310.

[4] Barrett, op. cit., (CI), p. 210f.

[5] Wilson, op. cit., (GNT), p. 47.

[6] Burton, op. cit., (BL), p. 188; feels there is a reference to Gnosticism (Cerinthianism) in 1 John 5:6.

[7] Wilson, op. cit., (GNT), p. 40; and Mansel, op. cit., p. 77.

[8] Mansel, op. cit., p. 70.

in Hebrews: the attempt to distinguish the supreme God from the God of the Old Testament (Heb. 1:1), and the denial of the real Incarnation (Heb. 2:14, 16, 17).[1] There certainly seems to be a reference to some Docetic theories.[2]

If the term Gnosticism is interpreted in its widest sense, there is little doubt that certain of the New Testament books were written against a background in which Gnosticism was an element. This becomes clearer when we approach the end of the first Christian century.[3] And it is to that period that the Pastorals belong. It is clear that they are sometimes defending Christianity against a form of gnostic heresy, and this defence has left its mark on their theology and their ethic.

The false teacher is an evident problem in the Pastorals, but what exactly his teaching was is not so clear. These teachers laid great stress on their doctrine (1 Tim. 1:7), and did their best to attract followers (2 Tim. 3:6, Tit. 1:11). Some of them had been handed to Satan (1 Tim. 1:19, 20; 2 Tim. 2:17; Tit. 3:10), and some were Jews (Tit. 1:10), yet others were not.[4] At least five major elements can be distinguished in their teaching.[5]

First, we have the element of Mysticism. This was expressed in the myths, genealogies, and magic in the epistles. This false teaching was characterised as fables or myths and endless genealogies (1 Tim. 1:4). Nothing was farther removed from the serious content of the gospel than the irrelevance of this spurious doctrine.[6] These myths were described as Jewish (Tit. 1:14), fit for

---

[1]
[2]Burton, op. cit., (BL), p. 128.
[3]Mansel, op. cit., p. 60.
[3]Wilson, op. cit., (GNT), p. 59; feels that it is only at the end of the century when 1 John and the Pastorals emerge, that we find for the first time real traces of what may be called Gnosticism.
[4]Lock, op. cit., p. xvii.
[5]These are Mysticism, Speculation, Knowledge, Judaism, and Ascetism.
[6]Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 58; This doctrine is in direct contrast to the edification which should result from true Christian teaching.

old women (1 Tim. 4:7), and godless people. The fear was that the Christians would turn away their ears from the truth and listen to the fables (2 Tim. 4:4).

The genealogies (1 Tim. 1:4; Tit. 3:9) are said to issue in mere speculation and were connected with controversies over the law which according to the author, were unprofitable and vain (Tit. 3:9). The Jewish coloring of the heresy was again raised.[1]

Even magic was inferred as a possible ingredient in this heresy. The third chapter of 2 Timothy refers to the vices of men who had fallen, and mentions Jannes and Jambres (2 Tim. 3:8) as examples. The reference is to Exodus 7:11 and 9:11 where two of Pharaoh's magicians tried to demonstrate that they had as much power as Moses at working miracles. They were magicians whose folly was exposed,[2] and they probably represented the 'rebel' and the 'opponent.'[3] The insinuation here is that these heretics were guilty of magical practices. Because of this they were perverted in mind and failed the test (disqualified for the faith).[4]

The reference to myths may be gnostic in thought. Also the genealogies mentioned may refer to the list of emanations by which the gnostics sought to account for the creation of the world.[5] Barrett says there is a connection between the myths and genealogies, and Judaism and the Law.[6] Probably it

---

[1] I will discuss the element of Judaism later.

[2] Lock, op. cit., p. 107; "Their names are not found in the Old Testament, Philo or Josephus, but in slightly different forms in late Jewish Targums, one perhaps as early as the first Christian century, in heathen writers (Pliny, Hist. Nat. xxx. I. II; Apuleuis, Apol. c. xc.); and in several Christian Apocryphal writings."

[3] H. St. J. Thackeray, The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought, (MacMillan and Co., London, 1900), pp. 216-21; also Schurer, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 149.

[4] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 197; says 'faith' has a definite article, and "therefore, probably connotes, as so often in these letters, the content of belief."

[5] Hanson, op. cit., (C), p. 23; and Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 40.

[6] Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 40; "Myths and genealogies then becomes a term for speculative treatment of the Old Testament, referring specifically perhaps to stories of the creation, and other stories respectively."

is a 'both-and,' not an 'either-or' situation.[1] No matter what the origin was, the element of mysticism is evident, and these false prophets basically wanted to engender specualtion - "one guess leading to another, one problem giving rise to a further one."[2]

This leads us to the second element - speculation. Speculation creates doubt, vain discussions, godless chatter, controversy, and semantical problems. What better way to turn someone away from his belief than to get him involved in this?

1 Timothy 1:6, uses *astochein*, 'to fall short,' or 'to shoot wide,' but its use suggests a wilful error rather than unfortunate lack of success. It was not love that was expressed by these false teachers but a 'wilderness of words,'[3] or 'vain jangling.'[4] This sums up the irrelevance which formed one of the main features of this heresy. It was just vain discussion. The author was not against discussion in general, but vain discussion specifically. These people had left the main road and wandered into by-paths.[5] They became just empty talkers (Tit. 1:10).[6]

'Godless chatter' was characteristic of these heretics (1 Tim. 6:20; 2 Tim. 2:16). This chatter was referred to as 'knowledge.' Timothy was to avoid this 'profane' jargon,[7] and to refuse to adopt the method of those who used it, yet, not to turn his back on them.[8] One was to have a rival thesis. The idea of a contrast was emphasized,[9] not godless chatter. In 2 Timothy 2:16,

---

[1] Hanson, op. cit., (C), p. 23.
[2] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 9.
[3] Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 42.
[4] Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 60; suggests that without the triad of virtues mentioned, just meaningless chatter is produced.
[5] Parry, op. cit., p. 4.
[6] Easton, op. cit., p. 86; They preach "pernicious nonsense," which gives the sense of "talking nonsense and perverting minds."
[7] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 82; says the word 'profane' has been used already (4:7), and denotes that which is common, in contrast to that which is sacred."
[8] Lock, op. cit., p. 76.
[9] Hort, op. cit., (JC), p. 140.

one sees that the noun underlies its futility (the profane, godless chatter), while the adjective "hints that it is materialistic and bias, substituting human speculation for divine revelation."[1] Anyone who talked this way was bound to end in ungodliness.

The heretics enjoyed controversy (1 Tim. 6:4; 2 Tim. 2:23; Tit. 3:9). Controversies and arguments were what they craved for. There was a suggestion that they had become diseased with questions and strifes of words. Intellectual wrangling often ended in moral deterioration.[2] The advice was that Timothy should not debate with them (2 Tim. 2:23), which does not sound Pauline at all. Debate breeds quarrels, in which personal animosity drives out any desire to find truth.[3] This controversy was a tool, or a weapon, of the heretic.

Connected closely with this idea of controversy is the semantical problem (1 Tim. 6:4; 2 Tim. 2:14). The battle of words has no end. It is a vicious method of teaching, useful to no true end.[4] Through the false teachers' love of controversy they turned aside from the central verities of the faith to trivialities both non-essential and unedifying.[5]

These teachers were convinced that they alone possessed correct knowledge. No one was as correct and knowledgeable as they were. Their conceit (1 Tim. 6:4) was based on a false knowledge (1 Tim. 6:20).

These false teachers believed the resurrection had already passed (2 Tim. 2:18), which was a natural perversion of the teaching of Paul (Romans 6:1-11), and the gospel of John (17:3). Some gnostics denied that the true Christian

---

[1]Kelly, op. cit., (C), pp. 183-4.
[2]Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 111; and Scott, op. cit., p. 73.
[3]Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 108f.
[4]Parry, op. cit., p. 57.
[5]Simpson, op. cit., p. 136.

would ever die,[1] and all held that there would be no resurrection of the body.[2] Justin Martyr argued against this.[3] Some even suggested that the resurrection took place in their children.[4] Whatever the belief, it was anti-Christian, and this was what the heretic referred to as his extra knowledge.

This made him proud and conceited (1 Tim. 6:4). He felt important and wise, yet had a false estimate of himself. He was wrapped up in his false knowledge (1 Tim. 6:20). He claimed his teaching was the true science or knowledge (gnosis).[5] His knowledge, supposedly superior, was to be understood in myths and genealogies, in asceticism, and in believing that the resurrection had passed.

Mysticism, speculation, and knowledge all point to a gnostic stream of thought. But there was also an element of Judaism which has been detected in certain passages.[6] The false teachers professed to be 'teachers of the law' (1 Tim. 1:7); some of them were of the circumcision (Tit. 1:10), and were taken up with myths and genealogies (1 Tim. 1:4; Tit. 1:14), and engaged in disputes about the law (Tit. 3:9).

The Jewish character of this false teaching was expressed in their desire to be "teachers of the law." This was an honorable title in the New Testament,[7] and the author of these epistles wasted no time in telling them that they had no clear idea of what they were saying. Also, as has already been said, in myths and genealogies, we see the Jewish element. These may be Jewish legends.[8]

---

[1] Lock, op. cit., p. 99; speaks of Iren. 1.23.5 of Menander; and Tert. de Anima. 50; Justin Martyr, Apol. 1:26, Dial. 80; and Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 111.

[2] Lock, op. cit., p. 99; speaks of Iren. 2.31.2 of Simon and Carpocrates; Tert. de Res. Carnis. 19.

[3] Lock, op. cit., p. 100; quotes Otto, Fragments on the Resurrection, ii, p. 211.

[4] Falconer, op. cit., p. 85; refers us to Th. Mops., with other Greek and Latin interpreters.

[5] William Barclay, The New Testament, vol. 2, (Collins, London, 1969), p. 148; says a gnostic "was a man who, as they claimed, had gnosis, which is wisdom, and gnosticism is the way of wisdom."

Amongst the circumcized in these epistles there are also vain talkers and unruly people (Tit. 1:10). The Jewish teachers active in Crete during this time had these heretical qualities.[1] Christian gnosticism in its early phases had a tendency to combine Jewish practices and beliefs, with pagan beliefs.[2] This may be what was referred to here. Jews of the Dispersion tried at times to represent certain sides of Jewish life as a higher philosophy.[3] Such teaching found support in Gnosticism.

First, the heretic was accused of immoral behavior, and then he was accused of ascetic rigour. Two distinct ways of life were produced, when touched with the dualistic way of Gnosticism.[4] The element of asceticism was evident.

The heretic forbade marriage (1 Tim. 4:3) and enjoined abstinence from foods (1 Tim. 4:3; possibly 5:23; and Tit. 2:4). These verses point to an incipient Gnosticism with its dualistic view of matter. The author struck at the root of dualistic Gnosticism, which denied that God created matter.[5]

This rigid ascetic view was not on the grounds of legal distinction between clean and unclean, but of the "evil character of matter."[6] This view was not exceptionally characteristic of any one form of contemporary religion.[7]

---

[6]Wilson, op. cit., (GNT), p. 42.
[7]Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 48; In Acts 5:34, it refers to Gamaliel.
[8]Hanson, op. cit., (C), p. 52.

---

[1]Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 187.
[2]Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 158.
[3]Hort, op. cit., (JC), p. 116f.
[4]Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 13.
[5]Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 93.
[6]Parry, op. cit., p. lxxxviii; "This appears from the combination of abstinence from marriage and abstinence from certain 'meats.'"
[7]Hillard, op. cit., p. 39f; gives a good summary of the views against any special group such as the Essenes; and quotes Lightfoot (excursus on the Colossian heresy) as saying that the heresy in this part of Asia Minor was a result of the combined influences of Gnostic speculation and Judaism of the Essene type.

Ascetism was found in some of the early gnostic developments, but because ascetism was evident it does not mean it was definitely gnostic.[1] Even though there is a tendency to feel that conceptions of purity and holiness were Jewish, one has to keep in mind that they were not confined to Jews alone.

The conclusion is that the characteristic of the background of these heretics seems to have had at least two major elements: Jewish and Gnostic. The elements mentioned can be classified under these two headings.

In concluding this study of the heresy in the Pastorals, it is only fitting that we list the results of this heretical teaching on the people in this area where the epistles were written.

What the heretic did:

1) He taught for base gain (Tit. 1:11).
2) He taught a different doctirne (1 Tim. 1:3).
3) He disagreed with sound words (1 Tim. 6:3).
4) He felt godliness (or religion) was a means of gain (1 Tim. 6:5).
5) He denied God by his deeds (Tit. 1:16).
6) He refuted sound doctrine (Tit. 1:9b).
7) He was puffed up with conceit (1 Tim. 6:4).
8) He had a morbid craving for controversy (1 Tim. 6:4).
9) He gave heed to deceitful spirits and doctrines of demons (1 Tim. 4:1).
10) He believed the resurrection had passed (2 Tim. 2:18).

Result of the heresy:

1) It bred quarrels (2 Tim. 2:23).
2) It created men who were factious (Tit. 3:10).
3) It was upsetting whole families (Tit. 1:11).
4) It led people to ungodliness (2 Tim. 2:16).
5) It led to aimless teaching (1 Tim. 1:6).

---

[1]Wilson, op. cit., (GNT), p. 41f; argues that ascetism is found in quite a few different religions and sectarian groups; and A. Voobus, Celibacy: A Requirement for Admission to Baptism in the Early Church, (Stockholm, 1951); says a demand for celibacy was a pre-requisite for baptism in the early Syrian church; yet, A. F. J. Klijn, The Acts of Thomas, (Leiden, 1962), p. 192f; doubts Voobus view; and Matthew Black, The Scrolls and Christian Origins, (Nelson, Edinburgh, 1961), pp. 27f; traces an ascetic element in Essenism to the ancient Israelite institution of the Nazirate; Schurer, op. cit., (II, ii), p. 211; advises caution here.

Heretics in relation to Truth:[1]

1) They had lost grip of the Truth (1 Tim. 6:5).
2) They had shot wide of the Truth (2 Tim. 2:18).
3) They defied the Truth (2 Tim. 3:8).
4) They stopped their ears to the Truth (2 Tim. 4:4).
5) They turned their backs on the Truth (Tit. 1:14).

The Pastoral Epistles reveal that the author was zealous to equip the churches with sound doctrine so as to insure for them the services of a regular ministry, and protect them from new and pernicious heretical ideas. This sound doctrine is not defined, and the author of the Pastorals did not feel it necessary to defend it. This may indicate that the doctrine was handed down, and not just a product of his own reflections.[2] Therefore, the author's concern was to fight false doctrines and outside beliefs by adhering to the soundness of the doctrine within the church. The theology of the Pastorals is rudimentary in character and in form. It is negative, polemical, and in defence of all that is said.

> "He must hold firm to the sure work as taught, so that he may be able to give instruction in sound doctrine and also to confute those who contradict it."[3]

At this point in history the standard of moral conduct and the theological belief of the church were well grounded. The words of the Lord were not thought of as the source of doctrine, but as the standard. That standard was defence enough to the author of the Pastorals.

The author was not the inventor of a theology or a theologian. He was a Christian expressing the doctrine of the primitive church in order to ward off what appeared to be threatening dangers.[4] As Goguel says: "Christianity had

---

[1] Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 63; reminds us that the truth is used in the Pastorals for the content of Christian faith, and used in defence of the heresy.

[2] Goguel, op. cit., (PC), p. 324; states that this shows that the author's theological thoughts run along lines which are traditional and conventional.

[3] Titus 1:9

[4] Holtzmann, op. cit., p. 159; says the theology of the Pastorals represents a

by then assumed the character of tradition; it had a past to which it clung and remained faithful; the religious life appeared to be based on adhesion to a system of inherited truths."[1]

The author of the Pastorals was responsive to the tradition of the early church and of Paul. He was expressive of Pauline theology but it was also quite expressive of Hellenistic thought.[2] "To say that the Pastorals do not reproduce the theology of Paul, is not at all to say that their 'bourgeois Christianity' does not in many respects represent a necessary new interpretation of the primitive message under the presupposition of the abandoned imminent expectation."[3]

The theology in the Pastorals was determined by two forces of the time. One was the heretical teaching which seems to be of Jewish-Gnostic origin. This teaching was probably within the church.[4] It is something that occurs at any time when there are new people becoming a part of something rather foreign to them. Each group - new and old - impose their past beliefs on one another. Therefore, the false accusers were probably within the circle of the church seeking to impose their way. In reaction to them were the traditional religious

---

Paulinism which declares its essential agreement even with Judaic Christianity, so far as it was convenient for the church in that situation, in common opposition to Gnosticism and heresy."

---

[1] Goguel, op. cit., (PC), p. 70.

[2] Kummel, op. cit., p. 269; "The Pastorals contain a series of sayings which are in line with the central thoughts of Paul; the salvation of the sinner through Christ (1 Tim. 1:15f), the revelation of the grace of God now through the appearance of Christ (2 Tim. 1:9f); justification not by works (Tit. 3:5), faith as a way to eternal life (1 Tim. 1:16)." On the other hand one encounters Hellenistic terms strange to Paul (Tit. 2:10f, 3:4, 3:6, 2:13; 1 Tim. 2:15, 6:15, 6:16; 2 Tim. 1:10).

[3] Kummel, op. cit., p. 270.

[4] Sohm, op. cit., p. 23; says that it was the persecution from within, not from without, which the church had to fear. "Far more fatal was it that the self-same powers with which Christianity had to battle had found their way into the very heart of the community, where their aim was to destroy the true character of the Christian creed and thereby to sap the forces of its life."

people who felt that they were wrong. The strong Paulinist probably represented the leadership of this second group.

The other influential force came from outside the church. This was not anymore organised than the force within the church. These people represented the melting pot of the world. They belonged to the pagan environment. These two forces helped to create the theology of the Pastorals. It was their inter-reaction that developed the theology in the Pastorals, especially in regard to the nature of God.

There are few passages which refer to the nature of God.[1] Some would say that even these are to be slightly discounted because they belong to the liturgical formulae which had taken shape in the church,[2] but that is questionable. Their value lies in their expression of beliefs which were widely current during this period of the developing church.

God is the Supreme of the ages (1 Tim. 1:17), the King who governs the ages. These terms were not new to the Jewish world. As G. F. Moore says of God's exaltation, "the attribute King fell in with a marked tendency of the times;" although, once it was a novelty in Jewish writings.[3]

As King, God is considered as immortal and invisible, a view which was common in Greek philosophy and also in later Jewish speculation.[4] Epicurus spoke of God: "First, believe that God is a living being immortal and blessed."[5] And Clement of Rome said in his doxology: "To the only invisible God, the

---

[1] 1 Tim. 1:17, 6:15, 16; possibly Titus 3:4, 5.
[2] H. A. A. Kennedy, The Theology of the Epistles, (Duckworth and Co., London, 1919), p. 238.
[3] Falconer, op. cit., p. 125; quotes Moore.
[4] Lock, op. cit., p. 17
[5] Hicks, op. cit., (Diog. Laert., x, 123), p. 649.

father of truth, who sent forth to us the Savior and prince of immortality, through whom he also made manifest to us, ..."[1]

In contrast to the religious ideas of their pagan environment, the Pastorals think of God as one, the only living God.[2] He is immortal and dwelling in unapproachable light.[3] Parallels may be found in the Old Testament,[4] and perhaps it is from Judaism that the Pastorals derived their ideas.[5]

The relationship they had to the heresy of the day would also explain their view of God. Their view of God was in contradiction to the heretical views. For one and the same God to possess creative, immortal, and redemptive powers was against gnostic theories. The distinction was drawn in the Gnostic thought between supreme God, the Father Jesus Christ and the Creator.

This brings us to God as Creator. God is related to life in its creative and continuing form in the Pastorals. Everything that God creates is good (1 Tim. 4:4). Nothing that he creates is to be rejected, or thrown away (4:4).

This is just the opposite of Gnostic thought. The Gnostic was convinced of the evil of matter and regarded this world as under the sway of hostile powers.[6] Therefore, he considered the Creator as one of these powers. A distinction was then made between the creating God and supreme God. The Creator in Gnosticism was hostile to man and was over against the supreme God. The author of these epistles said just the opposite. He had no dualistic view of God. God is one and the same - supreme Creator, immortal, invisible, and living.

---

[1] Lake, op. cit., (AF), p. 163; 2 Clement 20:5.
[2] 1 Tim. 1:17 (King of ages, the only God), 2:5 (the one God), 6:15 (only soverign, King of kings), 4:10 (living God), 6:13 (God who gives life to all things).
[3] 1 Tim. 6:16.
[4] Paul Feine, Theologie des Neuen Testaments, (Leipzig, 1910), p. 541.
[5] Kennedy, op. cit., p. 238.
[6] Wilson, op. cit., (GP), p. 184; says for this view, see Bousset-Gressmann, 251, 331f.

In Gnostic thought the creator God was an inferior being: but the Pastorals stand strongly on the fact that there is only one God. "Everything created by God is good," says 1 Timothy 4:4. This certainly describes Him as the God of good gifts. He is the same God who gives life to all things (1 Tim. 6:13), and richly furnishes us with everything to enjoy (1 Tim. 6:17), if our hopes are directed rightly.

There is the possibility of a dual meaning here. If 1 Timothy 4:4 is a baptismal passage, then in baptism, God bestows the new blessed life in Christ.[1] If it is not a credal expansion of the baptismal formula,[2] then it may refer us to the God of creation, as Lock suggests, who protects us in danger and persecution.[3] The former seems correct, but both could be inferred.

This King of kings, Lord of lords, dwells in unapproachable light, and no man has ever seen him (1 Tim. 6:16). A constant feature in Gnostic thought was the contrast between light and darkness.[4] The light was associated with goodness, and darkness with evil in Gnostic thought. Since there is a strong tendency to associate God in these epistles with goodness, then this certainly could have been an honest effort on the part of the author to present the doctrine of Christianity in distinction to this heretical movement. This could possibly have been Christianity borrowing terminology from the Gnostic system to show that the God they worshipped was definitely a good God. It is also quite possible that this reference to light which encircles God had regard to Gnostic speculations on dark and malevolent powers.[5]

---

[1] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 143.

[2] Such as found in Justin Martyr, Apology, 1:61; and Roberts and Rambout, op. cit., (Iren. Adv. Haer. 1:10), p. 42f; and Holmes, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 43; de Praescriptione Haereticorum 36.

[3] Lock, op. cit., p. 72.

[4] Jonas, op. cit., p. 57; says that this symbolism meets us everywhere in Gnostic literature.

[5] Kennedy, op. cit., p. 239.

Another characteristic of God is hope. He is considered to be the hope of those whose end is toiling and striving; that hope is the hope of salvation, and it is set on the living God (1 Tim. 4:10). The ground of the Christian's hope is the living God. It is this living God who offers us ground for trusting, and one can endure anything if he sets his hope on him.

This idea of hope presents hope not just a single act, but as a continuous state.[1] God becomes hope to all men. He becomes a source of life, and can therefore be relied on to fulfil the promise of 1 Timothy 4:8.

> "... for while bodily training is of some value, godliness is of value in every way, and it holds promise for the present life and also life to come."

God is not only a universal hope, but was specially hope for two groups singled out by the author. First, he spoke of the widow -- the real widow. "She who is a real widow has set her hope on God and continues in supplications night and day" (1 Tim. 5:5). She had taken refuge with God.[2] He was hope, if she continued in prayer. Hope was and is for those who are desolate, left alone, always in need.

Hope is associated not only with the desolate but also with the wealthy (1 Tim. 6:17). The rich are warned not to set their hopes on "uncertain riches, but on God, who richly furnishes us with everything to enjoy." This is opposed to the ascetic view.[3]

The riches they are to place their hope in are not the uncertain ones, but God Himself. He alone insures the future. No human uncertainty (such as wealth) has any lasting value, therefore hope should be fixed on God.

---

[1] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 102; and Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 50.

[2] Hanson, op. cit., (C), p. 58; says this is almost a "technical term in the Old Testament ... Compare Psalm 91:2, 'My God in whom I trust,' where the LXX compares by using the same Greek phrase as we have here ... also found in 1 Macc. 2:61."

[3] Falconer, op. cit., p. 158; cf. Acts 14:17; but Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 88; says this passage does not imply asceticism.

God is the source of inspiration of the word of scripture (2 Tim. 3:16) and to man (3:17). Because of this inspiration the word is profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness. All of this is fine in God's sight if it makes the man of God complete, equipped for every good work.

The idea is that each of the sacred books has something to reveal to man, of the mind of God.[1] "To the Greek ear the word scripture conveyed no idea but that of a writing; and the adjective inspired is attached to it to guard against possible misunderstanding."[2] God became the inspiration of this writing. God inspires man in the same way, so that man can fulfil God's glory. God's inspiration enables man to confront any task that is at hand.[3]

The description of God as Savior is characteristic of the Pastorals (1 Tim. 1:1, 2:3, 4:10; Tit. 1:3, 2:10, 3:4).[4] Only in Luke and Jude do we find this description elsewhere in the New Testament.[5] To the author, God is the ultimate source of salvation. The hope that goes out into the unseen world is represented as resting upon God (1 Tim. 4:10).

This way of thinking of God goes back to the Old Testament.[6] Deismann says that the ground for adoption of this title goes back to the cult of

---

[1]Scott, op. cit., (C), pp. 126-7; says there are two problems in translation here; First, this does not involve a doctrine of verbal inspiration. Secondly, one has to be careful in reading too much into "all scripture" - "this has to be taken as 'the whole of scripture,' implying that everything stated in the Bible, ... must be accepted as divine truth." All scripture should be translated every scripture - referring not to the contents but to the books in general.

[2]Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 127.

[3]Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 115.

[4]This is not characteristic of Paul. He always attributed it to Christ.

[5]Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 40; Luke 1:47, Jude 25.

[6]Simpson, op. cit., p. 25; "... the 'God of our salvation' is an Old Testament title and the very expression referred to occurs in the LXX text (c.g. Dt. 32:15)."

Nero.[1] The possessive use of 'our' suggests that by this time it was an adopted Christian title.[2]

For the most part in the New Testament, Christ is referred to as Savior and not God. It was also a prominent term in Hellenistic religion, "more particularly in those phases of it which strove to meet the prevalent yearning for redemption."[3] The position of the earlier days had not been altered, and the developing church maintained inviolate the position of God as Savior.

God, as Savior, is impartial. He desires all men to be saved (1 Tim. 2:3-4). It is in virtue of his own mercy, not of their deeds, that he saves them (Tit. 3:4-5). This statement concerning impartiality is theologically difficult. Does God want all men to be saved? If so, then surely all would be saved. The answer lies in one of two places: first, this could be emphasizing God's "antecedent will,"[4] or, secondly, by the use of the passive infinitive, the author may be implying co-operation on man's part.[5]

John Calvin reminds us that if taken out of context this passage has many meanings, but in context it has one meaning: "God has not closed the way unto salvation to any order of men; rather, he has so poured out his mercy that he would have none without it."[6] No one can be excluded a priori from God's

---

[1]Deismann, op. cit., (LAE), p. 364; and Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 55; says that, "It would also have a contemporary significance in that the term 'Savior' was used in the cult of Emperor worship and was being applied to the infamous Nero;" and Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 5; also suggests that it "is employed in various pagan cults to mark the divinities who offered immortality to their worshippers, and its use in the Pastorals may be partly due to Gentile influence;" and Parry, op. cit., p. 1; "... it was a common epithet of Zeus, and of Aesculapius: and from Ptolemaic times of kings and afterwards of the Roman Emperors."

[2]Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 56.

[3]Kennedy, op. cit., p. 239; says the LXX employs this term to translate two Hebrew words for salvation," when used (especially in the Psalms) as descriptions of God."

[4]Barrett, op. cit., p. 50; says Spicq "stresses the verb used for 'will' - θέλειν not βούλεσθαι." Therefore, it is God's 'antecedent will,' his intention at creation, that all should be saved.

[5]Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 51; "implies co-operation on man's part (this is

saving purpose.[1]

Repentence leads to obedience to moral truth. God wants all men to know the truth, even the heretical teachers.[2] This knowledge of the truth (1 Tim. 2:4b) is the correct doctrine. It is the good news, the gospel. As a strong Paulinist, he follows Paul's doctrine that the gospel is the word of the truth.[3] Knowledge of the truth, therefore, becomes obedient insight into God's will.[4] This knowledge is intuitive rather than intellectual.[5] Again we see the open, yet subtle way that this author refutes the heretics, who strongly emphasize the intellectual truth.

Salvation is manifested through the word of God (Tit. 1:2-3). God has demonstrated the truth of his promise by actually revealing his purpose through the preaching with which the author was entrusted. God has not actually revealed eternal life but only the means to attain it.[6] This life has been brought to light by the Christian message.[7] For eternal life is manifested in it and its teaching.[8]

---

perhaps over-emphasized by the translation 'find salvation'), since man must consent to be saved, and where his consent is wanting God's will is frustrated."

[6]John Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, vol. 2, III, xxiv, (SCM Press, London), p. 984.

---

[1]Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 51; and Karl Barth, Church Dogmatics, II, i, (G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance, editors), (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1957), p. 508; speaks of selection and this verse; "a selection is made because they have all rejected and forfeited the preserving grace of the Creator as the only condition of their existence ... In this act of selection which constitutes the history of salvation God does not become nor is He different." (Difficulty for Barth, arises only when we separate the notions of universal salvation and an elective process).

[2]2 Timothy 2:25.

[3]2 Corinthians 6:7; Ephesians 1:13; Colossians 1:15.

[4]Romans 15:4; 1 Corinthians 1:5; Philippians 1:9.

[5]Falconer, op. cit., p. 127.

[6]Easton, op. cit., p. 80.

[7]Scott, op. cit., (C), pp. 150f; continues to say that this life "was in some manner inherent in the message."

[8]Ethelbert Stauffer, New Testament Theology, trans. by John Marsh, (SCM Press, London, 1955), p. 78; says that according to the credal formula of the early church, God's plan for time was established, and he has only revealed them to his prophets piecemeal (Rom. 16:25; Tit. 1:2f).

The word or doctrine of God (Tit. 2:10) is for all people, including slaves. Even a slave can respond and be a powerful witness to Christ. Christianity is equated with the teaching, for salvation is manifested in. this doctrine (or message, or word).

It is not by one's deeds, but by God's mercy that salvation is received (Tit. 3:4-6; 2 Tim. 1:8-9). Salvation is not earned, but it is given in virtue of God's mercy. This sounds quite Pauline, but may be a misinterpretation of Paul's meaning of righteousness.[1] Paul and the writer of the Pastorals used the term righteousness differently. Paul used it to express a relationship with God made possible by Jesus Christ. The writer of the Pastorals used it of moral quality in an ethical sense.

Salvation also comes by revelation (Tit. 1:2). God promised ages ago the hope of eternal life. Therefore, the ultimate aim of the apostleship is eternal life. The apostle's life looks beyond the today to the future, "to the purpose which God ordained in the beginning and will manifest at the end."[2] This is a matter of hope.[3] The function of the author was to promote that hope; but one was not to be so caught up in it that he forgot the present and all its implications.

It has been stated that salvation depends on God's mercy, not our deeds (Tit. 3:4-6), or our works (2 Tim. 1:8-9). What has not been stated is, why. 2 Timothy 1:9, says it is in virtue of his own purpose.

---

[1]Hanson, op. cit., (C), p. 119; and Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 174; says that the righteousness Paul speaks of is scrupulous observance of the Mosaic Law, with all its ritual demands; "while the 'works' which are here in question are those of moral well-doing."

[2]Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 126; but, Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 227; says the passage is narrowed unduly if this is emphasized too much.

[3]Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 182; says this hope is "the basis on which the superstructure of Christian service is built."

First, let us parallel this passage with Paul. Paul said:

> "We know that in everything God works for good with those who love him, who are called according to his purpose." (Rom. 8:28)

> "In him, according to the purpose of him who accomplishes all things according to the cousel of his will, we who first hoped in Christ have been destined and appointed to live for the praise of his glory." (Eph. 1:11)

C. H. Dodd says the expression of this purpose is Christ, the living, dying, resurrected Christ. This series of verifiable events express his purpose.[1] God's purpose is to help us conform to his Son,[2] that is, to enable us to share the form of his Son.

Karl Barth says the same thing but in a different manner. This purpose is love. It is a love that knows itself to be altogether the gift and operation of God, altogether the calling which is grounded upon the purpose comprehended in God before all time and before every moment in time.[3] MacPherson says that it is the "divine wisdom and love equally involved" which forms and effects this eternal purpose.[4]

Returning to the Pastoral passage one finds that it says "in virtue of his purpose, and the grace which he gave us in Christ Jesus." The ideas of purpose and grace have a close connection and both exemplify Christ.[5] Therefore, the God of salvation's purpose is the redeeming love of Jesus Christ. The purpose of God in the salvation of man is here spoken of as formed, and the grace thereof conferred. It is formed, conferred and manifested in evident application - in the incarnate Christ.

---

[1] C. H. Dodd, Epistle of Paul to the Romans, (Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1932), p. 139.

[2] F. J. Leenhardt, The Epistle to the Romans, (Lutterworth Press, London, 1961), p. 233.

[3] Karl Barth, The Epistle to the Romans, trans. by E. C. Hoskyns, (Oxford Un. Press, 1933), p. 323.

[4] John MacPherson, Epistle to the Ephesians, (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1892), p. 144.

God is referred to as Father only three times in the Pastorals.[1] All three of these cases are in the introductory remarks of the author and all are also connected with Jesus Christ.[2]

God as Father is related to mercy, grace and love. The Old Testament had spoken of God as Father in relationship to these three concepts.[3] Therefore, the writers of the New Testament took them over (Lk. 6:36, 11:42; 2 Cor. 1:3 1 Tim. 1:2; 2 Tim. 1:2), and used them in a Christocentric sense. God became the source of grace, mercy and peace.

All three passages are in the stereotyped epistolary address and are more or less formal. The meaning of God's fatherhood is deepened in each passage by the revelation of Christ. More abstract qualities are emphasized, says Lock, perhaps through the influence of Greek philosophy upon Jewish thought.[4]

Oddly enough, in each passage mentioned, God is not considered Father apart from sonship. The emphasis is made even though it is stereotyped. The places of Jesus and of God are firmly separated in definition, but the close relationship verbally might suggest a typical liturgical or ecclesiastical phrase used often by the church.

The Christological beliefs of the Pastoral Epistles reveal the testimony of their period as well as reflecting traditional views of the earlier church. Taylor says: "As through a glass darkly we can see how the Person of Christ was interpreted in circles in which practical and ecclesiastical interests were uppermost, and the beliefs which they inherited."[5]

---

[5]Lock, op. cit., p. 87; says this reference may be "either to the gift to mankind contained in the promise of the victory of the seed of the woman; or to the gift to mankind contained in the pre-existent Christ before the world was created, as even then he was the recepient of the Divine life of Sonship of which man was to partake: it was given to us in our ideal."

---

[1]1 Tim. 1:2; 2 Tim. 1:2; Tit. 1:4.
[2]1 Tim. 1:2 (our Lord); 2 Tim. 1:2 (our Lord); Tit. 1:4 (our Savior).
[3]Stauffer, op. cit., p. 144
[4]Lock, op.cit., p. xxi; He does not list such qualities.
[5]V. Taylor, The Person of Christ, (MacMillan and Co., London, 1963), p. 129.

The Jesus of history is represented in many statements throughout the Pastorals.[1] The mystery of their religion is the Jesus of history:

> "He was manifested in the flesh,
> Vindicated in the spirit,
> Seen by the angels,
> Preached among the nations,
> Believed on in the world,
> Taken up in glory."[2]

The belief in Jesus as the incarnate Christ (2 Tim. 1:10; Tit. 2:11, 3:4), certainly connects the belief of this later church with the traditional belief of the early church. The humanity of Jesus is unambiguously expressed in 1 Timothy 2:5 - "the man Jesus Christ." Incarnational summaries occur regularly throughout the later epistles.[3]

If someone is to mediate between God and man, he has to possess a complete human life. But the double name Christ Jesus shows the other side, which is just as important. He is a person who is at once Christ and Jesus. This double meaning has a "pregnant significance" if the verse is understood against the background of Gnostic heresy.[4] The divinity of Christ is not de-emphasized, but the humanity of Christ is emphasized to the listeners. The divine side is assumed, the human is stressed.[5]

These epistles conceive of Jesus as originally and essentially a man. He is the man of the seed of David (2 Tim. 2:8), who "witnessed the good confession under Pontius Pilate," that is, who became the most glorious of all God's martyrs (1 Tim. 6:13).

---

[1] He appeared (2 Tim. 1:10; Tit. 2:11), as a man (1 Tim. 2:5); 2 Tim. 2:8 (Davidic Descent); 1 Tim. 1:16 (Suffering); 1 Tim. 6:13 (Before Pontius Pilate); 2 Tim. 2:8 (Resurrection); 1 Tim. 3:16 (Ascension); 1 Tim. 1:15 (To save sinners).

[2] 1 Tim. 3:16

[3] 1 Tim. 3:16, 6:12f; 2 Tim. 1:10, 2:8, 4:1; Eph. 1:20f; Heb. 1:3f, 2:9, 6:2.

[4] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 22; "This was not a heavenly Christ, different from a man Jesus whom He used as His instrument, but one indissoluble personality, and it was that of a man, who was at once Christ and Jesus."

[5] Lock, op. cit., p. 28; says the author is thinking of a "gift given in the human life, a true man, no angel, no mere phantom appearance, but one living a human historic life."

The man Jesus appeared, and through his appearing (2 Tim. 1:10), the power of death was "subjected."[1] Victory over death was achieved by Christ through his appearing.[2] This is in contrast to 1 Corinthians 15:26, where victory will take place only after the return of Christ at the end.[3]

His coming into the world was to save sinners (1 Tim. 1:15). These are words they can trust (pistos ho logos), which implies that these might fit a formulation of Christian belief or practice already established. The reference might be to the gospels.[4]

Jesus fulfilled the Old Testament being of Davidic descent (2 Tim. 2:8). This emphasizes the true manhood of Christ, and also refers to the fulfilment of prophecy.[5] This prepares us for the refutation of Gnostic thought in 2 Timothy 2:14.[6] Here the reader sees his humanity as one who is more than just a man, but one who is associated with permanent rule and indisputable kingship.[7] To the outside world which asks its questions, this author has a safe answer about Jesus, by saying he is of Davidic descent. This is a guarantee that Jesus is the Messiah, as Paul has already said in Romans 1:3-4.

---

[1] Oscar Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, (SCM Press, London, 1959), p. 225; reminds us that the "verb καταργεῖν which the New Testament uses in many of these passages, has two meanings; 'to subject' and 'to destroy.'" "Timothy 1:10 used it to describe the victory over death already achieved by Christ."

[2] Falconer, op. cit., p. 76; notes that ἐπιφάνεια "occurs often in Hellenistic religious phraseology to denote the presence of the deity in his saving power in any manner or on any special occasion;" but, Richardson, op. cit., p. 54; reminds us that ἐπιφάνεια appears five times in the Pastorals; always in the sense of the final appearing of Christ in glory at the end of the age (except in 2 Tim. 1:10).

[3] Cullmann, op. cit., (T), p. 225.

[4] Lock, op. cit., p. 15; "The whole phrase implies a knowledge of Synoptic and Johannine language (Lk. 5:32, Jh. 12:47), and is a witness to their essential unity, but does not imply direct quotation from either;" and, Hanson, op. cit., (C), p. 28; finds parallels in Mk. 2:17 and Lk. 19:10.

[5] Bultmann, op. cit., (T), vol. 2, pp. 122f; feels that "Old Testament history could not be an historical account of the life of Jesus and the history of the church unless their eschatological meaning were to be sacrificed, as was done in Luke-Acts."

[6] Easton, op. cit., p. 52.

[7] Parry, op. cit., p. 56; and Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 104.

Coupled with the statement of Davidic descent is the statement of Jesus risen from the dead (2 Tim. 2:8). I do not personally find this strange when you consider that by coupling these two different types of phrases, the author was bringing together the two things that were needed to defend the faith against Jewish-Gnostic heretical teaching.[1] On the one hand there is the resurrected Lord who is living midst them, and on the other, there is the fulfilment of Jewish prophecy that the Messiah comes from the seed of David. This passage carries with it the characteristic Pauline emphasis on the resurrection, as well as the not so typical Pauline thought of the descent of Jesus from David. This brings together the Jew, ignorant of Paul (or hostile to him), and the Jew who still lived by the fulfilment of prophecy. This caters to the supernatural tendencies of the Gnostic, with this exchatological irruption of the risen Lord. It connects the world of David and the world of Jesus.[2] During the same period Ignatius was emphasizing this also.[3]

Prior to his resurrection, Christ Jesus made a good confession before Pontius Pilate in his testimony (1 Tim. 6:13). This may be an allusion to a confessional formula or hymn that had already become traditional.[4] There may even be a link with John's gospel,[5] or baptism,[6] or just a simple confession that Jesus Christ is the King of the eternal Kingdom of truth.[7] No matter what

---

[1] Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 143; finds this strange.
[2] Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 103.
[3] Lake, op. cit., (AF), p. 193, Eph. xvii, 2; p. 221, Trall. ix, 1; p. 235, Rom. vii, 3; p. 253, Smyrn. i, 1.
[4] Bultmann, op. cit., (T), vol. 2, p. 121; continues to say that when historical data occurs in the christological formulas, it brings to light a characteristic difference between Christian confessional formulas and 'paradosis' and those of the heathen.
[5] Hanson, op. cit, (C), p. 70; possibly links it with John 18:37.
[6] Lock, op. cit., p. 71; and Hanson, op. cit., (C), p. 70; says it goes deeper, and links it with baptism: "as Jesus made his noble witness and then endured the cross, so the candidate for baptism first makes his confession and then undergoes baptism, which is itself a form of showing forth Jesus death."
[7] Falconer, op. cit., p. 157.

the conclusion, it presents the human side of Christ again. He, too, had to make the good confession upon this earth.

We see the Jesus of history on the one side, now let us turn to the divine Jesus. It is clear that in the teaching of these epistles he is regarded as divine.[1] In this divine role he is considered Lord, Judge, Savior, and Mediator. But in none of these roles is he deified. He is within the orbit of deity, being divine, but is not deified in the Pastorals. Vincent Taylor says that "we may say with justice that these epistles represent a practical and unspeculative type of primitive Christianity in which Christ is tacitly assigned the powers and functions of God."[2]

Of all the titles in these epistles given to Jesus, Lord is the most common.[3] Of all the Christological titles, Lord is one of the richest. Stauffer says:

> "Its history is a compendium and at the same time a 'repetitorium' of New Testament Christology. For in a few years it passes through the main stages of the development of christological titles, and so takes us once more along the road from the pedagogic and monarchic to the divine honoring of Jesus Christ."[4]

The root of the adjective kurios dates back in history. Its meaning is "having power," or "having legal power," "lawful," "valid," "authorized," "competent," or "empowered."[5] In the Hellenistic era the noun was comparatively rare, but if gods and rulers were called lord, it must have developed in

---

[1] Taylor, op. cit., p. 131; says that this is quite clear when you see the references to the blessings which men obtain through him.

[2] Taylor, op. cit., p. 133; says the writer's "silence is not hesitation to affirm deity, but the fear of being misunderstood."

[3] Titles for Jesus: as Lord; 1 Tim. 1:2, 1:12, 6:3, 6:14. The following probably refer to him also: 1 Tim. 1:14; 2 Tim. 1:8, 1:16, 1:18, 2:7, 2:19, 2:24, 3:11, 4:8, 4:14, 4:22; and Lock, op. cit., p. xxii; says he is mainly thought of as the Risen Lord.

[4] Stauffer, op. cit., p. 114.

[5] Kittel, op. cit., vol. 3, p. 1041; gives a history of it and says that κύριος is used as an adjective from the classical to the New Testament period but does not occur as such in the New Testament or later Jewish literature. (Werner Foerster).

Hellenism.[1] The LXX has the first example of kurios used of deity as the translation of Yahweh .[2] And the scene reported by Suetonius, of Augustus, shows that the word was very much in the air at Rome.[3]

> "When the words, 'O just and gracious Lord,' were uttered in a farce at which he was a spectator and all the people sprang to their feet and applauded as if they were said of him, he at once checked their unseemly flattery by look and gesture, and on the following day sharply reproved them in an edict."

As far back as Psalm 110, the word kurios described the majesty of the king. Kurios means ruler, and as a ruler he lords over things. In the Israelite religion the sacred name Yahwehwas replaced in the Hebrew Old Testament by Adonai, and translated in the LXX as kurios. In this way the title kurios came to be identical in meaning with the name of God.[4]

"The New Testament took over this linguistic tradition but at the same time it applied to Christ the title kurios which in the Old Testament had been used for God."[5] In the gospels, when Jesus is called Lord it is a name of honor which first referred to his authority as a teacher.[6] It was equivalent to Rabbi, but it went on to acquire a meaning that goes far beyond the bounds of a teacher's function.[7]

The title Lord in the Pastorals implies power and validity. Jesus was majestic as the Savior and Son of God. When it is used of Jesus it implies the

---

[1] W. Bousset, Kyrios Christos, 1st edition, (Gottengen, 1913), p. 94f; and Kittel, op. cit., vol. 3, p. 1046f, (W. Foerster); and Bultmann, op. cit, (T), vol. 1, pp. 52f and 121f.

[2] Kittel, op. cit, vol. 3, p. 1046, (W. Foerster)

[3] Rolfe, op. cit., (Sue. Aug. 53), p. 207.

[4] Stauffer, op. cit., p. 114.

[5] Stauffer, op. cit., p. 115.

[6] Lk. 11:1; 12:41; Matt. 18:21; Jh. 13:13.

[7] Stauffer, op. cit., p. 114; cites Mark 4:38; Luke 8:4; Matthew 8:25.

resurrection and exaltation. When the Christians wanted to give the highest honor to the risen Christ, they spoke of him as Lord. This title runs throughout the whole New Testament.[1]

The word kurios in all its forms and derivations, always carries with it the idea of stability and authority. Whether it is used of a slaveowner, a king or a god, it has true dignity. When it is used of Jesus, it implies divinity.

Jesus as Lord has a special meaning to the Christians. In opposition to emperor worship, and heretical teachings, the Christian exalted the name of Christ as Lord. The confession Kurios Christos would no longer be valid if there was another kurios besideshim (such as Caesar).[2] It is not possible to say at one and the same time that Caesar and Christ are both Lord, because Lord is necessarily an exclusive title. This is why in Polycarp's writings we see the question: "What harm is there in saying 'Lord Caesar?'"[3] To the Christian, there was great harm because there could be but one Lord.

In the time when lords were feared and worshipped, the author of the Pastorals, like Paul, confessed his Lord, Jesus Christ, as the "Lord of lords" (1 Tim. 6:15). This title attained a deeper meaning than ever before.[4]

Jesus is referred to as judge only once (2 Tim. 4:1).[5] Judgement according to this passage is in the future. He is the one who is to judge the living and the dead. It is Christ who is to judge.[6] The Christian (probably Timothy

---

[1]Floyd V. Filson, Jesus Christ the Risen Lord, (Abingdon Press, Nashville, 1956), p. 51; says every book in the New Testament except the epistles of John has it, and this proves that the early practice continued without interruption.

[2]Cullmann, op. cit., (T), p. 220.

[3]J. A. Kleist, The Epistles and the Martyrdom of St. Polycarp, (8:2), (Longmans, Green, and Co., 1948), pp. 93f.

[4]Stauffer, op. cit., p. 115f; lists four ways that it attained a deeper meaning: 1) the name kurios was used in a wholly personal sense; 2) it takes on some color from the theology of the passion; 3) its emphasis falls on the risen Lord's power; and 4) it had an unmistakably antithetic character.

is taken as the relevant example) will have to give an account of the faithfulness of his ministry.[1] The coming of judgement could be a fixed element in a baptismal creed.[2]

The idea of Christ as judge is very Pauline, but whether or not the idea of the Messiah as judge is found in Jewish writings has been debated.[3] Acts 17:31 states that the world is to be judged in righteousness by the one man who shall render vengeance to all who know not God (2 Thess. 1:8-10). This man Jesus will come to judge the quick and the dead (2 Tim. 4:1). When God is spoken of as judge, it is through Jesus Christ (Rom. 2:16). Jesus seems to be the one who is directly engaged, and it is only where the apostle takes his stand before the advent of Christ, or where he speaks in accord with the Old Testament representations, that he speaks of God as the immediate judge (Rom. 2:6, 14:10).[4]

Since our writer is a Paulinist, then 2 Timothy 4:8,[5] which affirms the Lord as a righteous judge, must refer to Jesus. The thought here is not one of a generous giver but of a righteous judge.[6]

---

[5]Although 2 Timothy 4:8, refers to the Lord as the righteous judge.

[6]Easton, op. cit., p. 69; says Christ is the judge, but contrasts it to 2 Tim. 1:18, where he says God is the judge and Christ 'confesses' or 'denies' each individual; and Falconer, op. cit., p. 94; says Christ is judge, under commission from God.

---

[1]Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 115; This statement refers to "those who are alive at the time of his advent, and those who then are already dead."

[2]Lock, op. cit., p. 112; refers us to Acts 10:42 and 1 Peter 4:5.

[3]V. H. Stanton, The Jewish and the Christian Messiah, (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1886), p. 291; feels it cannot be found in Jewish writings; but Cullmann, op. cit., p. 157; says that "in the New Testament as well as in the late Jewish texts (especially in the Ethopic Enoch) the primary eschatological function of the coming Son of Man is that of judgement.

[4]G. H. Gilbert, The First Interpreters of Jesus, (MacMillan and Co., New York, 1901), p. 205.

[5]This verse has two opposite views from Hanson, op. cit, (C), p. 99; who says it is not Pauline theology; to Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 210; who says it is Pauline and opposes those who call it a "Pauline fragment."

[6]Lock, op. cit., p. 115; refers us to Rom. 2:6; Heb. 12:11 and Ig. ad Polyc. 6.

References to Jesus as Savior both direct[1] and indirect[2] are numerous in the Pastorals. The designation of Jesus as Soter occurs in the later Christian writings also, and some think that it originated exclusively in the Hellenistic environment.[3] Others have said that it signifies either a Christian protest against the pagan use of the term,[4] or others that Christianity was basically borrowing ideas from its pagan surroundings.[5]

Cullman and Bultmann

say it is connected with the Jewish and Old Testament concept rather than the Hellenistic one.[6] Soter was a common title in the contemporary ruler-cults.[7]

The theological development of the Soter concept came about in the time of the expanding church. Nothing is clearer than the objective of Jesus Christ in these epistles: He "came into the world to save sinners."[8] This is something that all should know by now - for "the saying is sure and worthy

---

[1]Tit. 1:4, 2:13, 3:6; 2 Tim. 1:10.

[2]1 Tim. 1:15, 2:5; 2 Tim. 1:10, 2:10.

[3]For this view see: L. Kohler, "Christus im Alten und im Neuen Testament," Theologische Zeitschrift, 9, 1953, pp. 42f; holds that the origin is purely Hellenistic; and Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 93; says the name probably was taken over from the Hellenistic religion, because Christianity had become a Gentile religion.

[4]Easton, op. cit., p. 172.

[5]Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 93.

[6]Cullmann, op. cit., (T), p. 241; and Bultmann, op. cit., (T), vol. 2, p. 79.

[7]Easton, op. cit., p. 231; says the descriptive form of the word, is used, "as when Ptolemy I is called 'savior' because of his universal well-doing and the help he has personally given." With Roman rulers, it was the same. With Julius Caesar, and Octavius, inscriptions honor them and their successors with the title Soter as an 'honorific epithet;' and Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 163.

[8]1 Tim. 1:15.

of full acceptance." This sounds as if it was not only well known,[1] but had been emphasized a great deal and was just being quoted in the passing. This is the over-riding theme of calling Jesus Christ the Savior.

As Savior, he first shows that there is life after death (2 Tim. 1:10; Tit. 3:7b). This is the gospel, the good news for all mankind. He abolished death and brought life. Christ is the Savior because men have received through him the knowledge of a life to come, which might imply a Gnostic view.[2] The redemptive work of Jesus was viewed primarily as a "revelation to the mind."[3] Contemporary writers express a similar feeling.[4]

Christ's death was regarded by the apostolic church just as he regarded it. His death was a means whereby a new people of God are 'redeemed.' He was the ransom (1 Tim. 2:6),[5] just as in ancient times Israel had been ransomed from Egyptian bondage. Salvation came through the sacrifice of himself (Tit. 2:13-14).[6] He redeemed us from all iniquity and purified us for himself "a people of His own" (Tit. 2:14). Thus we become the people of the new Covenant.[7]

Christ sanctified himself so that we may be able to live a good life,

---

[1] Lock, op. cit., p. 15; says it is probably a quotation, and says the whole phrase implies a knowledge of Synoptic and Johannine language (Lk. 5:32; Jh. 12:47), "and is a witness to their essential unity, but does not imply direct quotation from either;" and Parry, op. cit., p. 8; says the thought here is primitive and cannot be argued that the combined phrase was exclusively Johannine; and Falconer, op. cit., p. 124; says it is probably an expression of Hellenistic origin.

[2] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 94; says it might appear that the writer shared the Gnostic view "that the true work of Christ had consisted of imparting to His disciples a marvellous revelation as to the nature and origin of the soul, and the secrets of the higher world. This, however, is not the meaning."

[3] Kennedy, op. cit., p. 233.

[4] Lake, op. cit., (AF), p. 325; Didache, 10:2; "We thank thee .. for the knowledge and faith and immortality, which thou didst make known to us through Jesus thy Child;" and, p. 163; 2 Clement 20:5; "... the Savior and prince of immortality."

[5] Alan Richardson, An Introduction to the Theology to the New Testament, (SCM Press, London, 1958), p. 221; says this "metaphor could be that of the slave-market or that of the sacrificial system; probably both meanings would be present in the mind of the first century Christians."

[6] Ibid., p. 222; says "here the metaphor is taken from the sacrificial system, and it is being affirmed that Christ's self-oblation was an expiatory sacrifice on behalf of sinners."

[7] Acts 20:28; Eph. 1:14; 1 Peter 2:10; Tit. 2:14.

zealous for good deeds (Tit. 2:14b). His life was given so that he might set apart for God those who believe in him.[1] If men resolve to do God's will, then they are God's people. In a moral sense, they constitute a new Israel.[2]

The Christian message in Titus 2:14 is presented in a moralized form.

> "... who gave himself for us to redeem us from all iniquity and to purify for himself a people of his own who are zealous for good deeds."

The combination of the Old Testament material with an echo of the gospel tradition creates this.[3] One becomes zealous for good deeds for the church. These good deeds replace the traditions of the church (or synagogue) of the past.[4] New direction is found in Christ's sanctification.

Man is justified by the grace of Jesus Christ, which was richly poured out (Tit. 3:6-7). "Justified by grace" is very Pauline,[5] but the application is quite different.[6] J. N. D. Kelly combines the scholars differences and says that this justification of man, having been ratified in baptism, now allows him

---

[1]Scott, op. cit., p. 170; says the "idea of consecration is here combined with that of cleansing from all defilement."

[2]Lock, op. cit., p. 147; "Israel had been a peculiar people, to keep God's commandments (Dt. 26:18); the Christian Church has to have an eager enthusiasm for and to take the lead in all that is excellent, in all that will 'adorn' the doctrine."

[3]Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 138; says it "must be remembered that he is digressing here in order to present (in suitable form) the redemptive truth upon which the moral requirements of the paragraph are based, the 'indicative' of the Gospel which is the ground of the 'imperative' of the commandment."

[4]Falconer, op. cit., p. 113; says the "good works take the place of the Law and traditions."

[5]Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 206; says there is no denying that these words have a characteristic Pauline flavor; yet Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 176; disagrees; "With Paul these words have reference to something definite which was achieved for men by the death of Christ. Here they apply generally to the deliverance which we owe to God's goodness as displayed in the whole Christian message;" and Easton, op. cit., p. 103; agrees.

[6]Easton, op. cit., p. 103; says it refers to baptism - the event occurring before it.

not only to enter upon the new life of the spirit, but also to look confident-to the last day.[1] This combination does justice to the total meaning of this verse. To eliminate one or the other takes away from the passage.

Salvation is sacramentally mediated, and the agent of this sanctification is the Holy Spirit (Tit. 3:6). It is through the Savior that the Spirit is mediated to Christians, as a result of their faithful union with Christ.[2]

We may speak of the divine gift in various terms. It may be the bestowal of a new nature or a new faculty, or the gift of God's Holy Spirit, or the gift of union with Christ. All may be true terms when rightly defined, but the main fact is, that it is a gift of God which makes possible something that is impossible without it. Salvation, therefore is mediated sacramentally through the Holy Spirit, who is the agent of this sanctification.

It is the redemptive work of Christ that makes the gift of the Spirit possible, as well as making men possible recipients of the Spirit.[3] The reference has liturgical vibrations that possibly color its meaning;[4] but basically whether it refers to baptism or to Pentecost,[5] the idea is that salvation is sacramentally mediated and the agent of this sanctification is the Holy Spirit.

---

[1]Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 253.

[2]Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 253; says that this feeling is not explicitly stated elsewhere by Paul, but is implicit in his teaching.

[3]Parry, op. cit., p. 84; also refers us to Romans 3:24, Ephesians 1:13, and 1 Timothy 2:15.

[4]Hanson, op. cit., (C), p. 120; says it probably refers to the baptism of the individual Christian, and to Christ's baptism of the whole church through His death and resurrection.

[5]Lock, op. cit., p. 155; says the 'sheddings' refers to Pentecost as an abiding reality affecting each Christian, and goes back to Joel 2:28; as does Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 143; and Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 206; says that the aorist tense "points back to this historic event, but it clearly refers more directly to Paul and his associates experience of the Holy Spirit, as 'us' indicates."

As Savior, Jesus Christ established a link: he is the one Mediator between God and men (1 Tim. 2:5). In Rabbinic Judaism, Moses was the mediator. He was the commissioned agent of God. "Moses as mediator is thus the go-between who brings together Yahweh and His people."[1] Although Moses was the absolute mediator, the angels occasionally were called mediators, in Philo. The ideas of negotiator and peace-maker merge into one another.[2] There is a suggestion that the word comes from the LXX of Job 9:33.[3]

In Hebrews,[4] Jesus is called the mediator of the new covenant. In our epistles he is called the "one mediator between God and men."[5] But these passages differ in meaning. The mediator concept is Christianized in 1 Timothy 2:5. The statement confirms the universality of the divine will to save. Whereas in Hebrews, Christ replaces the mediator of the old covenant.[6] In Galatians, mesites is used by Paul of Moses.[7]

Clement 61:3 draws attention to the mediatorial function of Christ. It is quite amazing that this function of Christ comes at the end of every passage. It seems the mediator of 1 Timothy 2:5 is paralleled by the high-priest and guardian of Clement 61:3.[8] This certainly strengthens the liturgical value, and also the possibility that these books do belong to the same tradition.

---

[1] Kittel, op. cit., vol. 4, p. 615; gives a detailed explanation of the theological concept of the Mediator in Judaism, (A. Oepke).

[2] Kittel, op. cit., vol. 4, p. 617; says Moses is still the absolute Mediator, but Philo speaks of angels as well, (A. Oepke).

[3] Hanson, op. cit., (S), p. 57; suggests this because, "when we look at it in its context in Job, we cannot fail to notice how relevant it would seem to an early Christian, particularly perhaps in a post-Pauline era;" yet, Dibelius, op. cit., denies that there is any connection with the LXX here.

[4] Heb. 8:6, 9:15, 12:24.

[5] Jesus is only referred to as Mediator once in the Pastorals; 1 Tim. 2:5; and Buttrick, op. cit., vol. 3, (D), p. 330; says that this passage is probably a quotation from a primitive creed, than a theological reflection.

[6] Kittel, op. cit., (A. Oepke), vol. 4, p. 619f; and Richardson, op. cit., p. 229; direct access to God climinates the human mediator.

[7] Hanson, op. cit., (S), p. 56; says in this reference (Gal. 19-20), the fact

In the Pastorals, Christ is the only mediator.[1] In ascribing this function solely to Christ, the Pastorals exclude Jewish and Gnostic mediators. This would include Moses, the law, high priest, angels, or any aeon also.

As Emil Brunner states:

> "It is characteristic of the Mediator that not only does He identify Himself wholly with man, but also that He is absolutely united with God....Christ does not act merely as One who is absolutely united with men, but also as One, who is absolutely one with God, as the authorised representative of God, who makes an unconditional personal claim on man's obedience."[2]

Because of this the possibliity of any other mediator cannot be contemplated. Christ became the sole and unique mediator. He is not merely one mediator among others, but the unique one, because he removed the barriers that blocked fellowship with God.[3] He is the one man who embraced all in their lost condition and thus founded a new humanity in union with God. By doing this he became the mediator between God and man.

This passage from Timothy also affirms the Pauline doctrine of separateness. The mediator is separate from men and God. But, as yet, this separateness is not defined. This mediator may be separate from God and man. Or if we look at it from a polytheistic view, one might conceive of a mediator between God and men who was himself a God. But the author follows Pauline thought and

---

that the old covenant required the services of a human mediator is treated as a sign of its inferiority.

[8] Hanson, op. cit., (S), p. 63.

---

[1] Buttrick, op. cit., vol. 1, (D), p. 400.

[2] Emil Brunner, The Mediator, trans. by Olive Wyon, (Lutterworth Press, London, 1934), pp. 498-9.

[3] Filson, op. cit., p. 144.

defines this separation in a two-fold manner: "On the one hand, he says there is one God, and on the other hand says that the mediator was a man."[1] Dibelius reminds us that we still do not have a pure Pauline Christology.[2] Christ is mediator because of his statue and not because of his humble obedience, as in Philippians 2:1-11.

Before leaving the concept of Jesus in these epistles we note that one cannot help seeing that there is a very close association between Jesus and God the Father,[3] which is of course of the very essence of the continuing faith of the church.

Two points may be raised concerning this. First, there is a definite distinction kept between the two, with the exception of Titus 2:13.

> "... awaiting our blessed hope, the appearing of the glory of our great God and Savior Jesus Christ."

A distinction is made quite vividly.[4] There is no doubt that the author separates the two.

The second point is not so easy to reconcile. For, Titus 2:13 presents a difficult problem of exegesis. The question that is raised is one of deity. Is Jesus Christ called God in this passage? Do we have the deity of Jesus Christ stated explicitly?[5]

---

[1] Gilbert, op. cit., pp. 9-10; yet Hanson disagrees and says that if this passage follows Job 9, and Jesus becomes the mediator whom Job prayed to then it is unPauline: "for the mediator of whom Job prayed was to stand outside the parties, being neither God nor man. Paul thinks of Jesus as one who comes from the side of God to rescue man, not as an arbitrator who mediates between the two."

[2] Dibelius, op. cit.; found in Hanson, op. cit., (S), p. 62; "It points, in fact, to a status-Christology rather than a soteriological Christology."

[3] References sharing this are: 1 Tim. 1:2, 5:21, 6:13; 2 Tim. 1:2, 4:1; Tit. 1:1, 1:4, 2:13.

[4] Distinctions are God as Father, Jesus as Lord, or Savior - 1 Tim. 1:2; 2 Tim. 1:2; Tit. 1:4; the God who gives life, and Jesus who in his testimony - 1 Tim. 6:13; the idea of God and of Christ - 1 Tim. 5:21; 2 Tim. 4:1; or referring to Paul as a servant of God, and an apostle of Christ.

[5] Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 138; says it happened before in Rom. 9:5; Jh. 1:1; and Heb. 1:8; and Hanson, op. cit., (C), p. 116; says that God is used of Jesus in Jh. 1:1-18 and probably in Acts 20:28.

Outside of scripture, references to Jesus as God can be found. Ignatius wrote quite confidently of "our God Jesus Christ."[1] Emperors were addressed as both God and Savior.[2] Heathen gods and goddesses in contrast to Jehovah, have been called God and Savior.[3] Jewish writings intended for Gentiles occasionally used the words "the great God."[4] God and Savior was a commonplace expression in the religion of the day,[5] especially among Greek speaking Christians.[6]

If all this is taken into account then the author may have used the title God and Savior of Jesus as an indirect contradiction of the Savior ideas of the heathen cults. This usage may be an indirect opposition to the use of Savior in the Emperor cult and of the pagan gods.

If we approach Titus 2:13 on purely linguistic and grammatical grounds, the natural rendering is "the appearance of our great God and Savior, Jesus Christ," the assumption is that for the author Christ was now completely identified with God.[7] The absence of the article before the word Savior supports this,[8] but this interpretation is disputed.[9] The Fathers of the

---

[1] Lake, op. cit., (AF), p. 229; (Ignatius, Rom. 3:3)

[2] Hanson, op. cit., (C), p. 116; and Taylor, op. cit., p. 137; used to deify kings.

[3] Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 200.

[4] J. H. Moulton, Grammar of New Testament Greek, vol. 1, (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1906), p. 84; speaks of the Ptolemies, where one not two deities are meant; and Hanson, op. cit., (C), p. 116; and Lock, op. cit., p. 145

[5] Easton, op. cit., p. 95; and Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 138; notes its use in Hellenistic religion.

[6] Taylor, op. cit., p. 132; notes evidence from a 7th century papyri, "admittedly late," which attests such a phrase.

[7] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 169.

[8] Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 200; "although the tendency to omit articles in technical terms and proper names lessens the weight of this consideration."

[9] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 246; says the absence of the article cannot be decisive, "for Savior tended to be anarthrous (cf. 1 Tim. 1:1), and in any case the correct use of the article was breaking down in late Greek;" and Taylor, op. cit., p. p. 132; and F. Blass, Grammar of New Testament Greek, trans. by H. Thackeray, (London, 1898), p. 163; and G. B. Winer, Grammar of New Testament Greek, trans. by W. F. Moulton, (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1882), p. 162; says a second article is not necessary since Savior is qualified by the word "our."

church divide on this idea of separation,[1] even though the article supports the idea that the words apply to one person, instead of two.

Hort makes an excellent analysis that might help us find our answer when referring to the word megalou (Tit. 2:13). Hort suggests that by its "sense" it denotes "the supreme unapproachableness," and as an adjective "it compels Theo to be a pure substantive, and thus individualises it. It, to say the least, suggests division of substance, a separate Deity, the Deity of Tritheism, not the equally perfect Deity of a Person of the One Godhead." This is very unlike Paul or New Testament thought, says Hort.[2] Yet some have found in this word "great" evidence to describe Christ as a Divine being of exalted rank though not the absolute God.[3]

Lock says this is not a question of doctrinal importance,[4] but I disagree. It is definitely a doctrinal problem. This identification of God and Jesus is not made elsewhere in these epistles. Along with Hort's analysis of the use of megalou, we need to examine the use of epiphaneia in its context.

The mentioning of the word "appearing" usually distinguishes between God and the Messiah. The same is true whenever the parousia is mentioned in the New Testament, or even in early Christian literature. It is taken for granted that it is the Messiah who is meant, and that the Messiah is distinct from God.[5]

---

[1] Lock, op. cit., p. 145; says Justin Martyr, Apol., 1:61 and Ambrosiaster favor separation; Clement of Alexandria (Protr. 50:1); Chrys., Jerome, Thdt. and Theod.-Mops and Pelagius, and the liturgy of St. Basil keep them together.

[2] Hort, op. cit., (EJ), p. 103.

[3] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 170.

[4] Lock, op. cit., p. 145.

[5] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 169; says "He comes in the power of God, accompanied by angels, but He is the representative of God, not God Himself."

The use of the word epiphaneia of the accession to imperial powers of a Roman Emperor may well supply the key to the meaning here.[1] The idea would be that of the taking of the kingdom by the true king.[2] It is also used in Second Maccabees of God's supernatural appearances in aid of his people. And in heathen use it was "consistently employed to set forth these gracious appearances of the higher powers in aid of men."[3]

The point is this: where the general use of these two words is considered, it seems to indicate that they are used to describe the divineness of Christ, and not his deity. Because the parousia is mentioned, the Messiah is distinguished from God, and the use of the adjective "great" before God emphasizes the idea that it is the glory of this great God with which Christ is invested at his coming. As Scott has said so well: "... The full effulgence of Divine glory will surround Christ at his coming. The idea of greatness belongs to the glory although it is transferred to God, from whom the glory emanates."[4]

Therefore, to say that Christ is designated as God is more than doubtful.[5] Especially if you take into consideration 1 Timothy 2:5 and 1 Timothy 3:16.

> "For there is one God, and there is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus..."

> "Great indeed, we confess is the mystery of our religion: He was manifested in the flesh, vindicated in the Spirit, seen by angels, preached among the nations, believed on in the world, taken up in glory."

---

[1] Moulton and Milligan, op. cit., p. 250; or Lock, op. cit., p. 144; and Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 137; sometimes it is used of a state appearance of a great monarchy; but, Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 199; says the "fact that such terms as "Savior of all men," "grace," and "appearing" were all part of the technical language of Emperor-worship proves nothing in this context, which echoes sentiments which formed part of the very texture of primitive Christianity."

[2] Lock, op. cit., p. 144.

[3] Trench, op. cit., p. 356; so Dionysius (Hal. 2:68).

[4] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 170; also says: "That Christ is distinct from God seems to be evident from the allusion which follows to the work which Christ had accomplished." (referring to verse 14).

[5] C. A. A. Scott, Christianity According to St. Paul, (Cambridge at the Un. Press, 1927), p. 274.

We must without doubt, in spite of the want of τοῦ before σωτῆρος, think of two persons, the "great God and Savior Jesus Christ."[1] This of course does not prevent us from recognizing that Christ has become a partaker of divine glory.

Some have sought to find indications of a belief in the pre-existence of Christ in these epistles. A. H. McNeile says that "what is true of the glorified Christ was true of the pre-existent Christ." Christ supposedly existed invisible to man, and at a certain moment became visible.[2] He feels pre-existence can be inferred from expressions such as, "He came into the world," or, "He appeared" (1 Tim. 1:15; 2 Tim. 1:10). This seems to be stretching the point. The stress on the incarnation are more Johannine than Pauline,[3] and needs a great deal of twisting to indicate pre-existence.[4] There would be more support for the idea in 1 Timothy 3:16 (that Christ was manifested in the flesh), if any support from this vague expression or dogmatic idea can be derived.[5]

The concept of the Holy Spirit is found on pages 310f. *

The eschatological outlook in these epistles is sparingly found. And when one finds it, it has an appearance of saying that there is a reward if one is ethically and morally sound. Of course the Pauline aspect of God's gift to

---

[1] Willibald Beyschlag, New Testament Theology, vol. 2; (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1895), p. 506; "The article before Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is wanting in the same way in the greetings: (1 Tim. 1:2; 2 Tim. 1:2; Tit. 1:4). But the reappearing of Christ is at the same time described as the appearing of the glory of the great God, that is, of the Father, cannot cause the least difficulty, as Christ, according to His own declaration, will come again 'in glory of His Father,' and His kingdom then appearing is also the appearance of His glory."

[2] A. H. McNeile, New Testament Teaching in the Light of St. Paul's, (Cambridge at the Un. Press, 1923), p. 214; also says that "He also is equivalent of God did not begin to be so at His human birth, but His eternal Being then became clear and manifest."

[3] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 54.

[4] Hanson, op. cit., (S), p. 112; disagrees and says a study of the Old Testament passages used by the author "makes it very difficult to deny that he did believe in the full pre-existence of Christ, or at least his sources did."

[5] Beyschlag, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 506; says "the πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ is supposed to be pre-existent in the same way as the πνεύματα of all men can be thought as pre-existent in God."

* Dr. Russell felt this section on the Holy Spirit needed to be at this point. The only reason it is not moved is because it would mean rebinding. If this is necessary I will do it.

man because of his concern and love is still quite evident. Salvation is dependent on the mercy of God (Tit. 3:4-6; 2 Tim. 1:8-9), and man is justified by the grace of Jesus Christ (Tit. 3:6-7). Yet there is a reminder to be good, choose a right vocation, exercise godliness, be upright and fulfil God's glory that is within you. The Christian's mind was turned toward the future but he recognized his responsibility to the present.

Eternal life is the predominant outgrowth of salvation in these epistles.[1] As with Paul there appears a "rich variety" of content, closely associated with the possession of the Spirit or the indwelling of Christ in the soul.[2]

Eternal life is first a result of faith (1 Tim. 1:16).

> "...but, I received mercy for this reason, that in me, as the foremost, Jesus Christ might display his perfect patience for an example to those who were to believe in him for eternal life."

Elsewhere, this connection of eternal life and faith occurs only in the Johannine writings.[3] The idea is that the person of Jesus Christ is the basis on which rests their faith in God. And it is not just in life in the present, but in eternity, that one should place his belief.[4]

As a result of faith, one can become sure of this eternal life. It is the blessed life of the world to come of which believers have a foretaste here.[5] Anyone can participate in this divine life through union with Christ.

---

[1] 1 Tim. 1:16, 6:12; 2 Tim. 1:1; Tit. 1:2, 3:7.

[2] Kennedy, op. cit., p. 245.

[3] Parry, op. cit., p. 9; "This direct connection of 'eternal life' with 'faith' is paralleled only in John 3:15, 16; 6:40, 47; 20:31."

[4] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 15; says the word 'believe' is "here used with a prefix which implies the resting of a weight on a sure basis;" and Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 46; says that this refers to a transformed moral life lived in this age, and equally to the full realisation of this transformed life in the age to come;" and Hillard, op. cit., p. 13; reminds us also that the Jews used the word 'eternal' in a sense in which they regarded time "as divided into a succession of epochs," such as the pre-Messianic and Messianic Period.

[5] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 55.

One can take hold of eternal life, in contrast with this passing and transitory life (1 Tim. 6:12). If you "fight the good fight of faith," you can get a grip on eternal life.[1] There is the feeling of laying hold immediately on eternal life in a single act,[2] not because Timothy is fighting a good battle, but because he has been called by God.[3]

The fulfilment of the promise of life comes through Jesus Christ. This promise denotes a message, which is nothing else than assuring men that in Christ, eternal life can be found.[4] This promise, according to the Christian understanding of the Old Testament,[5] confirms that God has, from the beginning, held out his promise to those who have faith (cf. Tit. 1:2). This promise may be regarded as either local (the life that is in Christ) or casual (the life depending on Christ).[6]

This promise is accepted in faith and built upon hope that it will occur (Tit. 1:2). The structure of Christian service is built upon this hope,[7] and rooted in God's promises. Common faith and godliness are continually sustained by this hope of eternal life.[8]

Hope is not only a foundation to build upon, but also an inheritance (Tit. 3:7). This eternal life is not spoken of here as a judgement day, but

---

[1] Parry, op. cit., p. 41; says the verb means 'to take hold of' or 'grip' not 'reach after,' or 'grasp at.'

[2] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 141; says it is here "conceived of as the prize for the athletic event."

[3] Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 86.

[4] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 87.

[5] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 153.

[6] Hillard, op. cit., p. 69; says the $\zeta\omega\acute{\eta}$ in such phrases decides this. The 'local life' is the one in which we have only by union with Him, and the 'casual life' is only given to us through Him.

[7] Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 182; and the "preposition epi suggests that such hope is the basis on which the superstructure of Christian service is built."

[8] Falconer, op. cit., p. 101.

(as has been said before) as a start of the Christian life, yet with further hope that it will become fuller and eternal.[1] Stress is laid on God's living action and nothing is said as to the condition.[2] This is done as an appeal to Christian behavior to the outside world.

Jewish habits of thought may be behind the idea of inheritance.[3] There is certainly a resemblance between these words and Romans.[4] The theological exposition has close connection with the practical object and is characteristically Pauline.

Once a man has thus accepted Christ as righteous, he may enter into full inheritance as a son, in realisation of the hope set before him in eternal life. As yet we only possess the life potentially, as an heir we have a future to look forward to.[5] Salvation is still an object of hope, but the phrase conveys the idea of assurance, "on the basis of which the justified believer may look forward towards full appropriation of his inheritance."[6]

To be an heir does not mean that all is well, no matter what occurs. It does not mean that full possession will happen without question. Man is an heir in hope of eternal life. Man's inheritance still lies in the future. The fulfilment of the promise is built upon hope, and the recipients become heirs of hope.

---

[1] Lock, op. cit., p. 155; and Hillard, op. cit., p. 125; says that, "The word δικαιόω refers to the action of a judge in declaring a man 'not guilty,' and is St. Paul's regular word for expressing God's free act of forgiveness and reconciliation made possible through the atoning sacrifice of Christ, and realised by the individual through faith in Christ. δικαιωθέντες therefore is here to be referred to as the beginning of Christian life."

[2] Parry, op. cit., p. 84.

[3] Lock, op. cit., p. 155; says this may be like the Jews of Canaan.

[4] Falconer, op. cit., p. 115; Refers us to Rom. 8:16f, and states that the thought is there, "both in its argument and in its application to the moral life; it is almost an epitome, apart from the discussion of the place and function of the law;" and Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 177; says this passage more than any others in the Pastorals reminds us of Paul.

[5] Scott, op. cit., p. 176.

[6] Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 207; reminds us also that the genitive 'or eternal life' may be taken with either 'hope' or 'heirs.'

There is also an element of immortality expressed in these epistles. This eternal life is almost synonymous with it.[1] It is declared to be the content of that good news which was brought by Christ.[2] Paul expressed this in 1 Corinthians,[3] and it denotes something which only God can bestow.[4] What was brought to light was done by Christ's teaching of the nature of eternal life and above all by his resurrection. The resurrection made the hope of immortality a certainty,[5] and the climax is an unchangeable life. In the developing church this may have been the embodiment of the central faith of the universal church. Immortality possibly was its most prominent element.[6]

Another permanent part of the eschatological picture was the expectation of Christ's appearing. Four terms are employed in the New Testament to express this event. The most common is parousia . Another is revelation (apokalupsis) the uncovering of something concealed. The third is manifestation (phanerothenai) or being manifested. The Pastorals show none of these in this context, but use an uncommon word to the New Testament (epiphaneia), in this sense.[7]

When the word epiphaneia occurs, with the exception of the one instance,[8] it is always in the sense of the final appearing of Christ in the

---

[1] Kennedy, op. cit., p. 245.

[2] 2 Tim. 1:10; and Cullmann, op. cit., (TNT), p. 225; gives a good explanation of the use of the verb καταργεῖν , with its two meanings in the New Testament. He reminds us that in 2 Tim. 1:10, the power of death is only 'subjected.'

[3] 1 Cor. 15:42, 50, 53, 54.

[4] Rom. 2:7.

[5] Lock, op. cit., p. 87.

[6] Kennedy, op. cit., p. 245; says this feature is emphasized in 2 Peter 1:4; its atmosphere is expressed in 2 Tim. 2:10.

[7] Trench, op. cit., pp. 353-57; gives an excellent parallel of these words.

[8] 2 Tim. 1:10.

glory at the end of the age.[1] In the Greek religion an epiphany is a theophany. It is a disclosure of a divine presence by a miraculous event.[2] The Emperor-cult described the Emperor's birthday or accession-day as the moment when god appeared. It was also an honorific term for a visit paid by him to some place.[3]

The expectation of the future parousia in the Pastorals has lost its hold on people. "The Christian faith is becoming a piety," as Bultmann says.[4] Still the believers await his appearing (1 Tim. 6:14f; 2 Tim. 4:1; Tit. 2:13), in hope of eternal life. But the present is no longer in eschatological tension, as with Paul. The tension between the present and the future (or longing for its fulfilment) is disappearing (if not already gone). Although looking to the eschatological future which has not been given up, the tension has passed.

The future is left in God's hands:

> "I charge you to keep the commandment unstained and free from reproach until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ; and this will be made manifest at the proper time by the blessed and only Sovereign, the King of kings and Lord of lords."[5]

The church is encouraged to go on with its work. A similar impression of "unhasting quietness of mind" is made by the description of Christians.[6] Christians are to continue on in hope of God's promise. His reappearing is no longer (as in Paul) conceived of as at a definite time or near at hand. It is the close of the work of salvation, now as ever expected with certainty (1 Tim. 6:4; 2 Tim. 4:1, 8; Tit. 2:13).[7]

---

[1] Richardson, op. cit., p. 54.
[2] Easton, op. cit., p. 172; says it is found in 2 Sam. 7:23, and in 2 Macc.
[3] Easton, op. cit., p. 172.
[4] Bultmann, op. cit., (T), vol. 2, p. 183.
[5] 1 Tim. 6:14-15.
[6] Kennedy, op. cit., p. 247; cf. Tit. 2:12, 13.
[7] Beyschlag, op. cit., p. 508.

The idea of the church appears, as in Paul, both in the sense of the individual congregation (1 Tim. 3:5), and of the whole church (1 Tim. 3:15).[1] The special interest of the author seemed to be with the latter.[2] Individuals were to champion the sound doctrine, but the whole church was to do this also, which leads us to the advanced idea of the church.

Three distinct stages of meaning make up the background of the meaning of this word ekklesia . In the free Greek city, it represented the lawful assembly of all those "possessed of the rights of citizenship, for the transaction of public affairs." The Septuagint supplied the link between the heathen world and the Christian church, where it was prepared for its highest meaning. It was used regularly of the assembled people of Israel (or of God).[3] When it arrived in the New Testament, it signified the new people of God, who were called out.[4]

Taking 1 Timothy 3:5 in context, we see the reference is to an individual (the bishop or overseer), concerning ruling his own household (3:4).

> "... for if a man does not know how to manage
> his own household how can he care for God's church?"

If he cannot rule his own household, how can he take care of the church of God? To take care of the house of God means conscientious care, otherwise one is unable to maintain inner freedom.[5] The same occurs in a household. If one

---

[1] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 87; says the author is thinking of the local community in 1 Tim. 3:15. "His comment may carry implications for the church universal, but no doctrine is explicity set forth here."

[2] L. Cerfaux, The Church in the Theology of St. Paul, trans. by G. Webb, and A. Walker, (Herder and Herder, New York, 1959), p. 320; disagrees with this and says that both passages deal with the local church.

[3] Trench, op. cit., p. 1f; discusses in length the meaning of the word; and William Barclay, The Mind of St. Paul, (Collins, London, 1958), p. 236.

[4] K. L. Schmidt, says in Kittel, op. cit., p. 28f; the derivation of the word is significant since the assembled citizens are called out.

[5] Falconer, op. cit., p. 134; says that Epictetus used the word ἐπιμέλεια to the use of "the outward goods of life involves conscientious care to maintain freedom" (this may give us a lead as to its meaning here).

cannot maintain good discipline with his family, then he will do so even less in a larger group. The potential skill in a large sphere is governed by similar skills in a lesser sphere.[1]

The individual responsibility brings dignity to the family. Correct control within the family is an indispensable virtue for the church officials. The worthy home-life has no parallel. Yet, as it is obvious to see by the preceding verses, what is asked of the overseer is asked of the Christians in general. A well thought out analogy is exemplified. Leaders of the church in these epistles have to have control over the comparatively small charge, which is completely under their own authority (the home), and control over the greater charge, over which authority must be won and kept by proof of personal fitness (the church).

A parallel between the family and the church is similar to the analogy between the family and the state in the classical writers.[2] This certainty restates the importance of each family being a family. Once a family has this cohesion within itself, the surrounding society will be a better one because of the family's impact upon it. Laxity in morals within the family at this time called for stern discipline on the part of the Christian community. And the head of the family had to be sure that he was beyond reproach.[3]

The absence of the article before church (. . . ekklesias .) in 1 Timothy 3:5 places stress on the character of the society.[4] This in turn will effect

---

[1]Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 81; (cf. the rewards granted in the parable of the talents, Matthew 25:14f); and Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 32; says the surest test of his ability to direct the church, is found in the home.

[2]Lock, op. cit., p. 39; refers us to Seneca, de Clem. 9, and Tacitus, Agr. 19.

[3]Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 59; "It describes the bearing of the head of the family: seriousness, dignity, gravity."

[4]Parry, op. cit., p. 14.

the importance of the duty of the one who is to take care of the church. The author saw the local church's problems reflected in microcosm in those of the human family.[1] It may be significant to note that the same verb (proistēmi) is used here for fathers ruling their children, as is used later for elders ruling the church (1 Tim. 5:17).[2]

In reference to the wider responsibility, we find the church is called the household of God (1 Tim. 3:5).[3] It is no longer a material structure, but is "fitly framed together with living stones, here regarded in its visible aspect."[4] It is not the metaphor of a building as found in Ephesians 2:20-22, but rather of a family, God's household.[5] It is an assembly of people, who have come together for a common purpose.[6] They constitute a family, of which God is the head.[7]

As a family, universally or congregationally, they have a responsibility to all concerned. They are to be the pillar and bulwark of truth (1 Tim. 3:15).[8]

> "... if I am delayed, you may know how one ought to behave in the household of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and bulwark of the truth."

---

[1] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 78.

[2] Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 82.

[3] Lock, op. cit., p. 42; says this picks up 3:4, 3:5, and 3:12, and does not refer to God's house, but God's family; and says that this is not to the universal church (or family), but to the special community at Ephesus; and Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 87.

[4] Simpson, op. cit., p. 58.

[5] Hanson, op. cit., (S), p. 15; says it is worth noting that Paul never ambiguously calls the church the house of God, though we do find the building-figure occasionally.

[6] As has been stated previously.

[7] Richardson, op. cit., p. 263f says the "conception of the church as God's household or family logically involves the conception of the Fatherhood of God, not as the father of all men or even of certain very remarkable men ... God is Father of Jesus Christ, and he is 'our Father only because we are in Christ;'" and Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 39.

[8] The word 'they' refers to individuals, individually, or the family, collectively; and Hanson, op. cit., (C), p. 45f; the time of the Pastorals, to the Great Sanhedrin, a college of scribes who made authoritative pronouncements about the interpretation of the Law; these rulings were widely accepted by orthodox Jews;" and Hanson, op. cit., (S), p. 19; suggests that 1 Tim. 3:15, was the work of an early Christian theologian, who originally composed a midrash on 1 Kings 8:10-13.

Pillar indicates strength, and bulwark represents that which makes something steady, a buttress or foundation.[1] Pillar and bulwark are needed for the defence of the church. The truth is alive in Christ, and through man is rooted in the church, which is a pillar and bulwark of this truth.[2]

The truth becomes the full revelation of God in Christ. The preservation of the true, steady, pillared, buttressed or witnessed faith has to be the function of each congregation, especially as the representative of the universal church. Each Christian has to be a strong bulwark of the gospel against all assaults of false teaching.[3]

The theme of these two passages refers to the behavior of the individual. The greatest importance is still attached to the life and character of the individual. The emphasis is on knowing how to conduct oneself. Parry says it most vividly:

> "... the principles of true and full Christian conduct are the subject of the letter, which are pressed upon Timothy as responsible for enforcing them. That conduct depends upon the fact that the Christian life is to be lived in a household of God."[4]

The main theme of the epistle deals with the ordering of one's life. Each living society of Christian men is here in view.[5] The Greek verb anastrepho means to conduct oneself,[6] and therefore, the thought behind these verses is of man's behavior.[7] First, it is connected with the family; and secondly,

---

[1]Bertil Gartner, The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament, (Cambridge, 1965), pp. 66f; offers parallels to hedraioma from the Qumran documents, and says it means foundation.

[2]Easton, op. cit., p. 136; "Because God lives, His church lives also and has power to uphold and defend the revelation entrusted to it."

[3]Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 88.

[4]Parry, op. cit., p. 21.

[5]Hort, op. cit., (CE), p. 174.

[6]Guthrie, op. cit., (C), pp. 87-8.

[7]Hanson, op. cit., (S), p. 15; "It seems likely that the author of the Pastorals has in this passage imported the idea of household as a link between Christian behavior (how to behave in the household of God) and the church as God's house, which is what the midrash he quotes is concerned with."

with his responsibility to bear the burden of the church, and to spread the truth to all mankind. If his behavior is not superb, then in both of these areas of his life he will fail.

Very little allusion is made to the concept of the Holy Spirit in these epistles. When it is made, it is definitely concerned with inspiration. He is the source of inspiration in Christ's life, to the prophets and to the newly baptised.[1] He also is the source of an inner power which enables the Christian to be loyal to his trust.[2]

First, the Holy Spirit is connected with the past (Tit. 3:5).

> "... he saved us, not because of deeds done by us in righteousness, but in virtue of his own mercy, by the washing of regeneration and renewal in the Holy Spirit."

The Spirit is connected with baptism, and is regarded as the agent of the cleansing which takes place in baptism.[3] This cleansing is more than that offered by Jewish ceremonial ablutions. It is a washing that will entirely renew our nature. This refers to the beginning of a new Christian life.[4] It is the divine act in that beginning, not the human condition of repentance or faith, that is spoken of as bringing about a new creation. As Scott says, "God's action was not due to any definite motive - our own deserving or even his own pity - but was simply in keeping with his divine nature.[5] Richardson

---

[1] 1 Tim. 3:16, 4:1; Tit. 3:5; and Richardson, op. cit., p. 337; says this baptism includes the washing away of all sin and the driving out of all unclean spirits.

[2] 2 Tim. 1:14.

[3] Gilbert, op. cit., p. 92; says this is similar to the meaning in 1 Cor. 6:11-12; 2 Thess. 2:13; "He is the source of consecration and holiness."

[4] Lock, op. cit., p. 154; and Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 252; says the author is disguishing two processes of 'washing;' of baptism proper, and the subsequent restoration effected by the Holy Spirit;" and Gilbert, op. cit., p. 175; says Tit. 3:5 connects salvation with baptism more definitely than do the genuine Pauline letters.

[5] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 175.

states that God's Spirit is God acting.[1] And God is a vital God, "who grants vitality to his creation," according to Berkhof.[2]

The spiritual life comes from the Spirit. It is not a descending function from father to son; it is imparted to each individual by a spiritual birth. H. B. Swete, referring to Titus 3:5 says:

> "No context in the New Testament exhibits more clearly the place of the Spirit in the economy of human salvation, its relation to the justifying grace of God, the redeeming work of our Lord, the sacramental life of the baptised, the eternal life of the saved."[3]

What happens to the individual is rebirth or regeneration, and renewal. The past is put behind us, and the future is his because of regeneration. Palingenesia was a word current in Stoicism for "periodic restorations of the natural world."[4] It also had associations with the Rabbinic title for a convert to Judaism, and with the Greek mysteries.[5] But it had a wider connotation with Philo (de vit. Moys. ii. 12), Josephus (Ant. xi, 3. 9) and Cicero (ad Attic. vi. 6).[6] Here in Titus, it is connected with the baptismal bath which the Spirit is related to.[7] It cleanses the past,[8] not in a magical way, as with the mystery religions,[9] but with faith first, then baptism, which

---

[1] Richardson, op. cit., p. 105.

[2] Hendrikus Berkhof, The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, (The Epworth Press, London, 1964), p. 14.

[3] H. B. Swete, The Holy Spirit in the New Testament, (MacMillan and Co., London, 1910), p. 248.

[4] Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 205; and Lock, op. cit., p. 154; and Swete, op. cit., (HS), pp. 390f; says that the author (he feels it is Paul) suggests a contrast between the Stoic 'regeneration' and the Christian: "the one by fire, the other by water; the one physical, the other spiritual; the one subject to periodical relapses and renewals, the other occuring once for all and issuing in an endless life."

[5] Lock, op. cit., p. 154.

[6] Swete, op. cit., (HS), p. 390.

[7] Berkhof, op. cit., p. 51.

[8] Trench, op. cit., p. 65; Regeneration is "that free act of God's mercy and power, whereby He causes the sinner to pass out of the kingdom of darkness into that of light, out of death into life."

[9] Falconer, op. cit., p. 115; the mystery religions commonly used it to a higher existence after death.

together bring new birth. It is also inclusive both of moral renewal in the present and future life after death.[1] Rebirth is the work of the Spirit in regeneration, "the new creation within,"[2] for the old has passed, the new has come.[3] Regeneration is therefore the quickening of the soul by the Spirit of God through the implantation of the life of Jesus Christ. The new life passes from the old fallen nature into God's hands, and lives as a new creation. The renewal that is thus begun has to be carried out and maintained by the continuous indwelling of the Holy Spirit.

The process of the renovation or gradual restoration of the divine image is expressed by the use of the term renewal in Titus 3:5.[4] Renewal means the transformation of that which was previously there. It is an elevation to a new order of being which the Christian undergoes in baptism.[5] Rebirth denotes passing to a new status, and renewal is that inward change which brings about this transition.[6] This change in both aspects is due to the Spirit. The past is affected but so is the present.

Not only does the Spirit renew and regenerate what has previously been, but he dwells within us (2 Tim. 1:14) and gives support to the present tasks at hand.

> "... guard the truth that has been entrusted
> to you by the Holy Spirit who dwells within us."

---

[1] Kittel, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 688; "It does not mean only attainment to a new life with the end of the old life, nor does it mean only moral renewal; it embraces both," (Rudolf Bultmann).

[2] Simpson, op. cit., p. 115.

[3] 2 Cor. 5:17.

[4] Trench, op. cit., p. 65; and Simpson, op. cit., p. 115; says "it is a characteristically Pauline locution for the second constituent element in the work of the Holy Ghost in the believer's soul."

[5] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 252; and Filson, op. cit., p. 253.

[6] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 175; "A creature is born when all its members have been moulded into perfect shape."

Timothy has been entrusted with the truth by the Holy Spirit who dwells within him. It is not on his resources that he is to rely but on the help of the Holy Spirit.

It is the Spirit who entrusts Timothy with his present responsibilities. That responsibility is to preserve the tradition handed to him.[1] The Spirit offers aid to Christians. The difficulty arises when we try to discover whether or not the early church believed that all Christians possessed the Spirit, or whether it became, like the later doctrines, a special endowment of the church's ministry. There is great debate as to which the Spirit belongs, some prefer the first,[2] others the latter.[3]

But the question seems not whether this refers to every Christian or only to the specially endowed, the point is that it exemplifies God's action of entrusting responsibility to the Christian people, and especially to those who accept their responsibility. The Holy Spirit dwells in all Christians; some have special responsibilities, but all have been entrusted with sharing the truth found in Jesus Christ. This is the responsibility entrusted to us all.

We are comforted by the Holy Spirit who dwells within us (2 Tim. 1:14). These words express the power and help at Timothy's hand.[4] The Spirit is there to help him in the fulfilment of this trust. Because of this indwelling Spirit, man finds meaning understanding and direction for life.

---

[1] Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 98; cp. John 16:14f.

[2] Hanson, op. cit., (C), p. 80; Easton, op. cit., p. 46; and Guthrie, op. cit., p. 134; "The indwelling Spirit performs the same function in every Christian."

[3] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 97; and Lock, op. cit., p. 89; and Kelly, op. cit., (C) p. 167; "It was his view ... that every ministerial function in the community had its appropriate endowment of the Spirit, and it was natural that, as the need for preventing heretics from tampering with the gospel became more pressing and obvious, he should extend this to the special responsibilities of men like Timothy and himself in this regard."

[4] Filson, op. cit., p. 176; says the Spirit "is not subject to the will of believers, the New Testament speaks of him as the 'Holy Spirit' who dwells within us."

There is also indication that the Spirit is connected with revealing the future (1 Tim. 4:1).

> "Now the Spirit expressly says that in later times some will depart from the faith by giving heed to deceitful spirits and doctrines of demons.."

This warning may refer to a well known oracle which was current in the church,[1] or to the words of Paul himself.[2] During this time, the gift of prophecy was a cause of "acute difficulty."[3] There was always the danger of false prophets but all indications here go to show this to be a Christian prophet proclaiming the future through the Spirit. Such an advance warning is not unusual when looked at against its background of heresy and Jewish belief.[4]

In the Pastorals the idea of the Spirit or Holy Spirit receives little recognition as compared with Paul. Paul's religion was Spirit filled, but the Holy Spirit in these epistles receives only perfunctory mention.[5] The idea of the believers mystical union with Christ is scarcely present at all.

The concept of faith in the Pastorals is identified with Christian doctrine. The traditional element becomes the important thing in Christianity in the Pastorals. The experience of Christ becomes less rich and profound, and faith moves into a different realm. Virtually faith is identified with recognised Christian doctrine,[6] although it does sometimes include the deeper relation.[7] It has become an objective body of teaching, a specific belief,

---

[1] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 44; "Christian prophets, under the influence of Spirit, were continually making forecasts of future events, and an important announcement of this kind would be preserved and circulated;" and Falconer, op. cit., p. 139; says it may be an apocalypse or letter that is referred to.

[2] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 44.

[3] Streeter, op. cit., p. 147.

[4] Gilbert, op. cit., p. 110; speaks of the Jewish theology that taught, "that no one sins until the spirit of delusion, that is, Satan enters into him." (Weber, Die Lehren des Talmuds, p. 228).

[5] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 18.

[6] 1 Tim. 1:19, 3:9, 4:1, 4:6, 5:8, 6:10; 2 Tim. 3:8, 4:7; Tit. 1:13, 2:2.

[7] 1 Tim. 1:16; 2 Tim. 1:12, 3:15.

for Christians to believe and accept. It is an accepted belief of the church objectively understood,[1] and is almost equivalent to what we call a Christian creed.[2]

Faith has become a synonym for orthodox belief. It is the right doctrine that is referred to when we hear of men who have made shipwreck of their faith, or have missed the mark as regards the faith (1 Tim. 1:19, 6:21). One is to be sound in faith (Tit. 1:13, 2:2) which evidently means to be orthodox, and from this expression the Pastorals found a solid technical term for right doctrine.[3] When the word faith stands for Christianity, it is used in a less personal sense (1 Tim. 3:9).[4] Men are urged to keep the faith - to show faithfulness (2 Tim. 4:7).

In Paul the result of faith is justification. Man is justified or declared righteous once he has accepted Christ as Lord and Savior. This relation is called righteousness. But in the Pastorals righteousness has a new meaning. Almost invariably it means right conduct.[5] It has become an ethical quality[6] rather than a religious relationship.[7]

Not only is faith identified with Christian doctrine, but it has become a fundamental Christian attitude. "It is said of the fables of the false

---

[1] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 18.
[2] Parry, op. cit., p. ciii.
[3] Bultmann, op. cit., (T), vol. 2, p. 135.
[4] Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 23; "The author thus differs to some extent from himself, though like Paul he too knows well that Christianity is more than a steady but superficial adherence to 'the faith,' and attacks those who 'preserve the outward form of religion, but are standing denial of its reality.'" (2 Tim. 3:5).
[5] Kennedy, op. cit., pp. 230f; "There is one instance of the conception of justification which recalls the Pauline usage, in Titus 3:5f ... This fine passage, which almost stands alone, echoes Paul's phraseology." In his footnote he says that "Moffatt places these verses in inverted commas, regarding them probably with justice, as a doctrinal statement current in the church."
[6] Kennedy, op. cit., p. 230.
[7] 1 Tim. 6:11; 2 Tim. 3:16.

teachers in 1 Timothy 1:4, that they minister questions rather than godly edifying which is in the faith."[1] They lead others to disputes rather than to the way of salvation. Therefore, faith is conceived as the subjective way of salvation.

It is obvious that the doctrine of justification by faith is wanting.[2] In these epistles, we are still saved by divine mercy and justified by God's grace (Tit. 3:5-7; 2:11; 1 Tim. 1:15, 16), but this justification is nowhere traced back to faith, and is made little of in comparison with the moral consequences of faith.

Faith is sometimes linked with other virtues, but most of the time it stands alone. Faith has an indirect connection with love,[3] but it seems to be just in a list with it.[4] Also there is a connection with hope,[5] but this is wanting. Faith is considered the fruit of salvation, an outgrowth, and not the root from which virtues spring.[6] It becomes the spring-board from which right living is launched. Some say this is very Pauline, and not out of the ordinary.[7]

---

[1] Beyschlag, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 510.
[2] Beyschlag, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 510.
[3] Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 42; and Easton, op. cit., p. 203.
[4] 2 Tim. 1:13, 1 Tim. 2:15, 4:12.
[5] Tit. 1:1,2; and Easton, op. cit., p. 203.
[6] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. xxxi; says in the Pastorals "faith is not so much a root as a foundation (cf. 1 Tim. 3:15, 6:19) - the necessary basis for all right living, though it does not of itself produce it."
[7] Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 43; compares the Pastoral passages with 1 Cor. 12:9; 2 Cor. 8:7; Gal. 5:27; Eph. 6:23; 1 Thess. 1:3; 3:6; 2 Thess. 1:3, 4; Philemon 5: and says they supply ample justification for such treatment of pistis. (Guthrie also says there are some passages that are not readily paralleled in other Pauline writings but he says they are "quite incidental to the main uses in the Pastorals.")

The characteristic Pauline use of the word and idea of faith is absent from the Pastorals. The full Pauline use of faith as the justifying principle is missing.[1] For Paul, faith was not just a Christian virtue among many other virtues, but a complete trust in Christ and self-committment to him. This is not the emphasis in these epistles. The thought of the apostle Paul is evident, but the outgrowth and continuation of this thought is not clear. Faith for Paul had inspiration, yet for this author it is largely orthodox. The object of the faith no longer needs defining, for it has become an established and essential quality of each Christian life.[2] It approaches nearer to the meaning of a faith professed and taught. It has become the Christian faith as the natural antithesis to heathenism.

The emphasis on the concept of grace is not as strong in the Pastorals as it is in Paul. It is so dominant in Paul that it is difficult to think of Pauline theology without it.[4] The noun occurs thirteen times in the Pastorals, of which six are in formulas.[5]

Grace is described as acting by a process of education (Tit. 2:11, 12).[6] Even though salvation is still a gift of God, the writer of the Pastorals allows co-operation on man's part.[7] Through the grace bestowed on us in the gift of Christ we are enabled to master all lower desires and follow the way of godliness.[8]

---

[1] Easton, op. cit., pp. 203f; "Conspicuously so in the three Pauline verses, 2 Tim. 1:9; Tit. 3:5-7; 1 Tim. 1:14. Only in the last of these does the word appear, but faith is, along with love, a result of justification, not its antecedent;" but, Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 43; says even though it is missing in the key passage on justification (Tit. 3:5-7), we cannot assume that such faith is excluded. He parallels it with 1 Cor. 6:11.

[2] Lock, op. cit., p. 20; even though Lock feels this way, he is doubtful whether the meaning is equivalent to the "Creed," or the "doctrines believed."

[3] Lock, op. cit., p. 21.

[4] Easton, op. cit., p. 207; says it occurs in Paul about seventy-seven times and is used in many different ways.

[5] Easton, op. cit., p. 208; These formulas open and close each epistle.

[6] Easton, op. cit., p. 208; In Tit. 2:11, grace has "so inclusive a force that it might be almost replaced by Christianity."

[7] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 10f.

[8] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. xxxi.

Richardson raises this point: "All election is the result of the operation of God's grace, by which we are saved."[1] He goes on to say that election is the result of divine grace, which works in history to accomplish God's ultimate purpose of salvation.[2] He defines election as the action of God's grace in history. Therefore, the special significance of the word grace, is that "it implies that God's choice of instruments has nothing to do with their merits, ... but rests solely on his unconditioned freedom."[3] Basically grace either has a secondary meaning to this author, as compared to Paul, or it is taken for granted. In any case grace is not emphasized as much in these epistles. Grace does not carry the emphasis upon the transforming power that it had for Paul. It has become, like faith, a foundation, a spring board, or a helping hand, in co-operation with which man can play his part (Tit. 2:11).

The one passage that expresses the attitude of the author of these epistles to the law is 1 Timothy 1:8-10.

> "Now we know that the law is good, if any one uses it lawfully, understanding this, that the law is not laid down for the just but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and sinners, for the unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers, immoral person, sodomites, kidnappers, liars, perjurers, and whatever else is contrary to sound doctrine."

The law is a wonderful thing to this author if it is treated as law (lawfully, correctly). The law is something used for defence in the Pastorals, which is quite different from Paul. It condemns evil doers, and is to be used in restraint of the immoral.

---

[1] Richardson, op. cit., p. 280; refers to Acts 15:11; Eph. 2:5, 8; 2 Tim. 1:9; Tit. 2:11, 3:7; (cf. Rom. 3:24).

[2] 2 Tim. 1:9.

[3] Richardson, op. cit., p. 281; "God's salvation itself is unearned, a free gift; so also is the privilege of serving God's purpose as an elected vessel of his design."

In connection with all that has been said, it is important to discuss the word paratheke. Even though it occurs in only in three places,[1] it has throughout these epistles a commanding role. The term is a legal term connotating something which is placed in trust in another man's keeping.[2] In classical Greek it was used of the actions of a man who had to take a long journey, and who deposited his valuables with a friend. The paratheke is always that of the depositor.[3] Even though its early derivation is legal, in these epistles it comes to have the idea of a fixed body of teaching which must be normative for the individual Christian and which has to be passed down unchanged from generation to generation.[4]

The question that arises, is what is the nature of this trust? It is best to take the passages individually, recognising the differences, if any, in the meaning. In 1 Timothy 6:20, and 2 Timothy 1:14 paratheke has the same meaning.

> "O Timothy, guard what has been entrusted to you. Avoid the godless chatter and contradictions of what is falsely called knowledge ..."
>
> "... guard the truth that has been entrusted to you by the Holy Spirit who dwells within us."

When all kinds of strange teachings were being advocated by heretical innovators, it was necessary to lay stress upon holding fast to the original apostolic deposit. Timothy was to keep what had been committed unto him. He was to guard the good deposit through the power of the indwelling Spirit.

---

[1] The substantive occurs twice (1 Tim. 6:20; 2 Tim. 1:14) in reference to Timothy and once (2 Tim. 1:12) in reference to the author.

[2] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 150.

[3] Lock, op. cit., pp. 90f; whereas the duty of the friend is φυλάσσειν and ἀποδίδοναι.

[4] Kennedy, op. cit., p. 235; says that "even apart from so technical a phrase, "the notion of an authoritative tradition is central."

This trust or deposit can be taken to mean many things. It can be used in the broad sense to mean Christianity in general.[1] In its narrower sense it can mean a fixed deposit,[2] or a special deposit given to Timothy by Paul.[3] In between these extremes are ideas, such as, the general deposit of sound doctrine, which is to be kept inviolate,[4] the Christian truth, or a spiritual endowment.[5] It may not mean specific instruction at all, but just the pure faith of the gospel.[6]

If we take this *paratheke* in its broadest sense, as Christianity or the truth, then we recognise that Timothy had been asked to guard this truth, and to keep it safe. That is to say, this deposit or doctrine should be kept uncontaminated by false knowledge. But if it is considered in its narrower sense, as a spiritual endowment or specific instruction, then Timothy having received it was to guard it with care, but not in such a way that he kept it from others. He was to guard it by avoiding profane and vain babblings, but this did not mean he was not to share it with others.[7] The church's life depends upon the faithfulness and purity of its doctrine,[8] and it was up to Timothy, as the church's representative, to keep the tradition inviolate against all the assaults of Judaism and pseudo-philosophy.[9]

---

[1] Hanson, op. cit., (C), p. 73; says it is a body of teaching or Christianity; and Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 82; says it can mean Christianity.
[2] Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 118.
[3] Parry, op. cit., p. 44.
[4] Hillard, op. cit., p. 68.
[5] Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 89.
[6] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 150.
[7] Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 118; says this point can be pressed too far.
[8] Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 89.
[9] Hillard, op. cit., 68; and Parry, op. cit., p. 44; says it involves "both administrative and teaching functions, including the guidance and control of other teachers. Hence follows here the description of certain kinds of teaching which are to be avoided and dicountenanced." Parry (p. xl), disagress that this means a body of doctrine which Timothy is to preserve correctly.

We do not have to exclude either interpretation, if we recognise that the importance lies not in what the trust is, but in how it was guarded. The deposit in 1 Timothy 6:20 is in sharp contrast to kenophōnias (lit. empty sounds) and gnōsis (knowledge).[1] No matter what the interpretation is, this deposit was Christian, and the babblings were not. It was the faithful sayings and the wholesome doctrine that were most important and must be preserved.

2 Timothy 1:12 presents a different usage of the word deposit.

> "... and therefore I suffer as I do. But I am not ashamed, for I know whom I have believed, and I am sure that he is able to guard until that Day what has been entrusted to me."

It does not have the meaning that it has in 1 Timothy 6:20 and 2 Timothy 1:14: the trust committed to Timothy. Here the trust is committed by the author to God, and he declares his certainty that God will keep it.[2]

This trust can be either himself,[3] the doctrine of the faith,[4] his teaching, his apostolic work, or his converts.[5] More than likely it is his life, and this would include all the others.

This idea of the deposit in 1 Timothy 1:12 has a certain obscurity about it because what the deposit was it never defined. All three passages emphasize and focus attention on someone's responsibility to guard it.[6] It is in this context that we get our indication of the meaning. Each passage occurs in context when the main thought is that of the false teaching which is the opposite of sound doctrine. It is this precious trust, which is the opposite of all corrupt and distorted teaching, which each Christian must guard, and yet share with others. The way to counter this false teaching is not to argue, but to condemn it by

---

[1] If we try to date this with Marcion, the Pastorals would be too late. This is a Jewish-Gnosticism, and Marcion was anti Jewish-Gnosticism (Jeremias, op. cit.; Barrett, op. cit, (C), p. 89; Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 151f; Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 83.

[2] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 96; says he calls on God to take the prescious deposit under his own protection.

[3] Hillard, op. cit., p. 75; "... his soul and life, and we can compare 1 Peter 4:19.

appealing to the sound teaching as the right teaching committed to the church.

Now that we have surveyed the theology of the Pastorals, it is only proper that we should note some of the outstanding differences between them and Paul. This will not be an exhaustive treatment of the subject, but simply a recognition of some of the differences.

Paul's idea of the nature of God is a good place to begin. Even though there is no essential difference from Paul's theology, there is a new emphasis. The Pastorals lay a great deal of stress on the unity of God, as against the dualistic tendencies of the Gnostic heresy (1 Tim. 1:17, 2:5, 6:15). Yet, Paul never found it necessary even to state this truth.[1] Therefore, the emphasis thus laid on the Divine absoluteness shows a polemical intention,[2] directed against false dualism in the contemporary situation. Another problem is the absence of Paul's most characteristic conception of God - his Fatherhood.[3] The idea of God in the Pastorals seems to be partially Jewish and partially Hellenistic, and the author calls God Father only in the opening salutation formulas.[4]

In the Pastorals it is God who is characteristically Savior, while in Paul, it is Jesus Christ who is characteristically Savior. In the Pastorals

---

[4]Scott, op. cit., (C), p. 96.
[5]Lock, op. cit., p. 88; and Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 165.
[6]Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 132; says that even in 2 Tim. 1:12, the deposit could be understood "either as what God entrusted to Paul or what Paul entrusted to God."

---

[1]McNeile, op. cit., p. 207; says the only exception is Romans 16:27; but he said that the use of the expression there is one of many reasons for thinking that that doxology is not the work of Paul.
[2]A. Sabatier, The Apostle Paul, trans. by A. M. Hellier, (Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1891), p. 376.
[3]Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 40; "The problem is not so much the use of terms not found in other Pauline epistles but the absence of what is claimed to be Paul's most characteristic conception of God, i.e., His Fatherhood;" and Kennedy, op. cit., p. 240.
[4]Easton, op. cit., p. 13.

Jesus Christ is rather the mediator of salvation than Savior.[1]

Paul never spoke of God as Savior. In fact he used the verb to save only once where God is clearly the subject: "It was the good pleasure of God through the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe" (1 Cor. 1:21).[2] He may have been avoiding to because of its past connotations.[3] Whereas in the Pastorals the word Savior is used explicitly of God six times (1 Tim. 1:1, 2:3, 4:10; Tit. 1:3, 2:10, 3:4).

In the Pastorals the nature of Christ is conceived of differently. The phrase 'in Christ,' so characteristic of Paul, is lacking in the Pastorals. It occurs,[4] but "in none of these instances is the phrase used to describe persons or with any mystical connotation."[5] Guthrie agrees, but he says that where this phrase is applied to qualities, "it is most probable that some mystical element is intended."[6] This may be stretching the point, for it seems the author of the Pastorals was quite untouched by Pauline mysticism.[7]

The image of Christ presented in the Pastorals is lacking in Pauline spirit and feeling, although composed of Pauline formulas.[8] The "mystic inwardness, the religious depth and the moral force that live in the Christ of Paul" have passed.[9]

---

[1] Beyschlag, op. cit., p. 504; "That is not due to any disregard of Christ, but from the need, probably already expressed in forms of public worship, of emphatically confessing amid the surrounding heathendom the one true revealed God."

[2] McNeile, op. cit., p. 210.

[3] R. Reitzenstein, Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen, (Leipzig, 1910), p. 117; says he avoids it because it was a technical term in heathen religions.

[4] 1 Tim. 1:14, 3:13; 2 Tim. 1:19, 1:9, 1:13, 2:1, 2:10, 3:12, 3:15.

[5] Easton, op. cit., p. 211.

[6] Guthrie, op. cit., (C), p. 41.

[7] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. xxi.

[8] G. A. Findlay in the Appendix to Sabatier, op. cit., p. 377f; says there is no defect, "either in depth or force."

[9] Holtzmann, op. cit., p. 166f; quotes Schenkel, p. 361f.

The passage denoting Christ as Mediator is found in Hebrews, but Paul did not use it of Jesus. If this truth is implied in Paul's Christology, he nowhere stated it.[1] It is a term he only used in Galatians of Moses.[2]

The conception of the Holy Spirit in the Pastorals is not basically different from that of Paul. But the Holy Spirit is only infrequently mentioned in the Pastorals, and there is nothing to parallel Paul's conception of the Spirit-saturated life of the Christian. The Holy Spirit in the Pastorals receives only perfunctory mention;[3] whereas, in Paul religion is Spirit-filled. The doctrine meant something to the author of the Pastorals,[4] but his emphasis is elsewhere. His thought about the Holy Spirit is not un-Pauline, but it has none of the fulness and richness of the thought of Paul.

Briefly, I will run through some of the Christian doctrines in which the Pastorals differ from Paul. In distinction from Paul, the Pastorals do not think of Christianity as faith as in Galatians 3:23, but as doctrine. This is a thought that is not altogether foreign to Paul (cf. Rom. 6:17), but in the Pastorals faith as commitment does not have the central thought it has in Paul.[5]

In Paul's teaching on justification and forgiveness, it is difficult to distinguish between justice and forgiveness. Forgiveness is implied in justification, and both are associated with the death of Christ; yet, in the Pastorals the whole view of salvation lacks the "freshness of profound experience."[6]

---

[1] McNeile, op. cit., p. 213; "Indeed, as far as language goes, he denies it in Gal. 3:20."
[2] Holtzmann, op. cit., p. 308.
[3] Kelly, op. cit., (C), p. 18.
[4] Easton, op. cit., p. 22; says it meant very little to him.
[5] Beyschlag, op. cit., p. 509; examples are 1 Tim. 6:1, and Tit. 1:9, 2:10.
[6] Kennedy, op. cit., p. 231.

Some say that the writer stands nearest to Paul in his idea of salvation.[1] Probably the greatest difference is in who is called Savior. The description of God as Savior is unusual. The God of creation is also the God of redemption, which is unique to the Pastorals and Jude.[2]

Law is approached from a different point of view from that of Paul. For Paul, the Law in its essential nature, is holy, just and good (Rom. 7:12). Yet, since no one can keep it, it pronounces condemnation on all. Because Christ came, it was made out of date for those who accept God's offer.[3] In the Pastorals the Law is less complicated, "it is simply that which condemns evildoers."[4] The author of these epistles is not concerned with the mistaken trust in the Law, but with the abuse of it by those who tried to combine a profession of Judaism with paganism.[5] Paul's dogmatic treatment of the Law is absent. It is no longer a burning question as with Paul. The Law still holds it prestige in the community, but here it is used as a restraint of immoral men: "its function is that of a statue against criminals."[6] This is not anti-Pauline, but in this form it is not Pauline.[7] Because the true Christian has made the will of God his own law, then human law to the author of the Pastorals exists for the punishment of those living in sin.[8]

---

[1] McNeile, op. cit., p. 215.
[2] 1 Tim. 1:1, 2:3, 4:10; Tit. 1:3, 2:10, 3:4; Jude 25.
[3] Hanson, op. cit., (C), p. 3.
[4] Hanson, op. cit., (C), p. 3.
[5] McNeile, op. cit., p. 217.
[6] Falconer, op. cit., p. 16.
[7] G. B. Stevens, The Theology of the New Testament, (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1906), p. 368; says these passages are not un-Pauline. "The meaning here is that the law was given to restrain the lawless," etc; he goes on: "It cannot be maintained that Paul meant to say that the law was given to increase the wickedness of these classes of persons. The peculiar Pauline doctrine of the purpose of the law as quickening the sense of sin does not here come into view."
[8] Beyschlag, op. cit., p. 512.

Grace was a transforming power for Paul, as it is in the Pastorals also. But in the Pastorals grace is also a helping hand, which allows for co-operation on man's part (Tit. 2:11f).[1] Grace is acting by process of education (Tit. 2:11, 12).[2]

The great crisis of the end, the Parousia, the resurrection, and the judgement look less definite to this author. For Paul they had their definiteness, for the Pastorals they have not (1 Tim. 6:14, 15). Without any speculation or eagerness, the future is left in God's hands. The church is encouraged to go on with its work of consolidation. The people at Ephesus and Crete are asked to live a life of self-control, righteousness and piety in this present world (Tit. 2:12, 13).

In conclusion, Holtzmann probably gives us a good reason why the theology has a new look. He feels that the author was in retreat from the "one-sided religious interest of former Pauline epistles in favor of a more ethical conception of the purpose of life."[3] The theological doctrine is now applied on all sides to the practical conduct of life. This is why we discuss in the Pastorals a new thought about Paulinism, but a new environment has necessitated new methods.

[illegible] (C), p. 18; and Scott, op. cit., (C), p. xxxi.

[illegible] Scott, op. cit., (C), p. xxxi.

[illegible] Holtzmann, op. cit., p. 172.

SECTION SIX: VALUE

The church of the Pastoral Epistles had to fashion a new life for herself in order to make use of her basic idea, both for the nurture of her own life in worship, instruction, discipline, confession of faith, and for her mission to the world. The church in these epistles represents the second and third generation of Christians. These Christians understood the immense task of evangelism to the Jewish and Gentile world. They wrestled with the religious and pagan systems of thought that were also competing for the loyalties of men.

The church in these epistles carries on her work with a sense of theological and ethical realism. Even though the church is not specifically called the Body of Christ, she represents that segment of mankind which alone publicly acknowledges that Jesus is Lord. As members of the church, the Christian people are adjusting to the fact that they have a lasting responsibility that involves stability and strength in its leadership. The church sees the need for placing men who are ethically spotless in positions of honor and authority.

Asia Minor, in the late first and early second certury was a melting pot of all kinds of religious belief. In this area the Christian church was seeking Christian unity, and it was a risk in Asia Minor as it is today in the twentieth century. The risk was that the quest for Christian unity could make the church even more excessively church-conscious and even less mission-conscious. Disunity in the church violated the purpose of Christ that all disciples might be one. Disunity also imparied the effectiveness of the common witness which the church must give by means of its koinonia in the Spirit. The church in the Pastorals wanted to offer herself as a model of unity. She endeavored to present herself as an ideal community of believers in which the highest values of the human spirit (truth, love, justice, hope, fellowship, godliness) were

not only honored rhetorically but were implemented without compromise or dilution.

There is great hope for the church in the Pastorals if one looks at it in a general sense and with a broad spectrum. There is no future for a church which cares too little about the shape of the future or about the welfare of the emerging human community. The Pastorals exemplify both of the preceding expressions of thought. They continue to pass on the deposit to the hope of tomorrow, and engage themselves seriously in some of the community problems (i.e. defending the faith against the heretics, and providing for widows). The author of the Pastoral Epistles is desperately concerned not to lose grip on what he knows to be traditional and good, and he hopes to hand it on to the new age.[1]

Every new generation of Christians must attempt to restate the convictions of the past in a new era and a new environment. These epistles lead the way in this field. Their value is that they show us what should be done, but not how it should be done. They instruct us in what our task is, not how to do it. Dietrich Bonhoeffer said: "The church is her true self only when she exists for humanity ... She must tell men, whatever their calling, what it means to live in Christ, to exist for others."[2] The church in the Pastorals has already shown us that she exists for humanity. But this same church also has become a community which is beginning to be primarily interested in her own survival and prosperity, and this seems to continue to be the case even today. Therefore, in the Pastoral Epistles we see a church in transition. It is a church at the crossroads of many important decisions. It is a church

---

[1] Barrett, op. cit., (C), p. 33; feels this idea of handing what he knows on to a new age is the greatest importance of the Pastorals.

[2] Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Letters and Papers From Prison, (Collins, London, 1953), p. 166.

faced with the task of taking a risk in the service of humanity, and providing a service, even to the non-religious categories of its society.

Therefore, it is important to consider the value of the Pastoral Epistles to our contemporary society. What value do they have for today? As this present writer continues to immerse himself in these epistles, he finds amazing paradoxes which keep making them even more valuable.

STABILITY/VERSATILITY: There are few books in the New Testament which show us the stability of the church's organization and ministry more than the Pastoral Epistles do. It is most important to the author to conserve such stability for the future church through these letters. He reminds Timothy of the truth that has been entrusted to him to carry on and to fulfil for the church's future (1 Tim. 6:20; 2 Tim. 1:14). Stability is always associated with the deposit.

Also, the idea of the church herself reminds one of stability (1 Tim. 3:5). The church becomes the model for God's family. The family was always the example of stability to the Jew. This is an advantage the Jew had over the Greek during this period of history.

The church is also the pillar and bulwark of truth in these epistles (1 Tim. 3:15), and no objection should be raised to that, as long as the church maintains that position wisely. The difficulty is that the contemporary Christian community has seen the church exclusively in that light for ages. The church has "repeatedly become the bulwark of religious rituals, changing from an emergency building to a worldwide super-structure, from servant to mistress."[1] The church in the Pastoral Epistles emphasized stability out of necessity. And, the same could be said of us today.

---

[1]Kasemann, op. cit., (F), p. 95.

Necessity always brings danger at its heels. Looking again at the Pastorals, we see that they are concerned with the enthusiasts, and they tackle this problem in an appropriately unenthusiastic and even anti-enthusiastic way, by tightening the church organization and taking the field against the extremist.[1] That is to say the Pastorals stabilize the character of the church in a chaotic environment.

The contemporary church's situation is basically chaotic, but to tighten organizational controls would be even more disastrous. As a pillar and bulwark of the truth, the contemporary church must look around herself, and outside herself and see where the areas of division, hostility, injustice, tension and illness lie. The church in the twentieth century must learn from the Pastorals that something must be done, although it does not have to follow the same pattern. Today's church finds herself in a situation where there is great disparity between rich and poor, white and black, educated and illiterate. The Pastorals, in a similar situation, fill the vacuum by tightening the church organization. The twentieth century church learns from these epistles that something must be done, but not that the same method must be used. Today's church would have to fill the vacuum by encouraging a freedom of expression for all concerned. The relevance of today's church is not totally in its stability, but also in its flexibility.

The relevance of the modern church as the pillar and bulwark of the truth is only real today if she becomes the servant of society. If she is too rigid in organization and in personal matters, she may forget her role in society. The church cannot afford to be a community gathered apart from, and over against the outside world. And the last thing the church exists to be is an

---

[1] Kasemann, op. cit, (F), p. 95.

organization for the religious. On the contrary, her charter is to be the servant of the world.[1] Stability is needed in such a task, but only if the church frees her community to serve.

Another sign of stability in the Pastorals lies in the ethical demand made upon the church leadership. The requirement is one of character. The church is being judged today, as then, by her leadership. The church is judged stable or weak according to her leadership. The unity of the church of the Pastorals is maintained not only through exclusive and single-minded obedience to the Lord of the church, but also through holding fast to the apostolic tradition by means of correct teaching (1 Tim. 1:3f, 4:16, 6:3f, 6:14, 6:20; 2 Tim. 1:13f, 2:16f, 3:14f, 4:2f; Tit. 2:1, 2:7f, 2:15), especially as vested in the church leaders (1 Tim. 2:4f; 2 Tim. 2:23f; Tit. 1:9). This is becoming the dominant motif, which means a strong emphasis on stability in her root structure, organizationally and doctrinally.

Theologically, also, the Pastorals exhibit stability. They try to identify with their surrounding environment theologically as well as ethically, and yet to remain stable. Even though the enthusiasm of Paul has vanished, what has emerged is a correct, serious, godly, almost pietistic approach to life. This type of Christian life demands self-control, obedience. The atmosphere called for elaborate lists of virtues intended to regulate their daily conduct.

The fervent theology of Paul has not cooled off in the Pastorals, but they have exchanged enthusiasm for stability, and this produces a rather mechanical atmosphere. The Pastoral author is wrestling with the problem of relating Christianity to Judaism. He is an inheritor of a tradition which he wants to convey in a relevant way, and this causes difficulty. He is entrusted

---

[1] J. A. T. Robinson, Honest to God, (SCM Press, London, 1963), p. 134.

with the truth, which is a criterion for the Christian profession, and is facing a different situation than that of Paul, a situation which calls for a different method. This is very relevant for the contemporary church if she follows the Pastoral author's method, and not so much his message. For the church today to read the Pastoral Epistles and say that this is what we should be and this is how we should present theology would be disastrous. But if today's church recognises that the Pastoral situation occurs during every generation of new believers, then they become relevant to us. Each new group of Christians must face what the people at Ephesus and Crete faced. Each group has to find an answer for their time, and each must react, even if the reaction is apathy. The message of the gospel is not diluted or radically changed, but the method of approach has been altered. Stability in certain basic beliefs is most important to the Pastoral author. They supply a valuable testimony to the Christological beliefs of the period.

At a quick glance at the Pastorals, we might be awed by the strong emphasis upon stability and permanency. It is true that there is such an emphasis, but it must not blind us to the equal possibility of versatility and flexibility.[1] On the one hand these epistles are emphasizing stability, but on the other hand, versatility is equally important to them.

This versatility and flexibility can be best expressed in the strong Christian ethic of the Pastorals. They continue to complement other canonical scripture with a definite Christian ethic. In fact, they probably exemplify

---

[1]The Glebe Memorial United Methodist Church in San Francisco is a 20th century example of this emphasis hinted at in the Pastorals. Rudiger Reitz, The Church in Experiment, (Abingdon Press, New York, 1969), p. 77; says as far as the structure of the church is concerned, emphasis is on "task forces" rather than permanency. "The uniqueness of this structure is the permanent alertness of Glebe Memorial for urban mission through its Community Meeting and task forces. As one of the staff members commented, 'We specialize in flexibility,' which means that the entire structure of this congregation is tuned to specific tasks in the urban region."

the strongest attempt in scripture to produce a Christian ethic. The worldly ethic of this period was lax and low. Therefore, the church had to take a stand, and it stood for a definite Christian ethic for all mankind. The Pastorals stand against an antinomian view of ethics, as well as against a puritanical view. It could not be said they are totally situational, although they do indicate this at times. What can be said of them, is that they possess a hint of legalism, and a touch of the situational approach, wrapped up in one package. Stability is expressed in the legalism, and versatility in the situational. For example, there is an emphasis upon not doing certain things (the negative ethic) on the one hand; yet, on the other hand, the Christian is called to an ethic of moderation in certain areas. This is no inconsistency, only flexibility. The emphasis is not a dynamic one, but it is there. These epistles show there is a necessity for Christian guidelines, but not strict rules to follow rigidly. They reveal the necessity of some kind of Christian style of living. This is where the Pastorals differ from the Greek character. They are flexible enough to identify with the Greek, but stable enough to express a truly Christian ethic. The Christian life in these epistles has a tone of deeper seriousness and severity than the Greek. There is a graver feeling about the way in which life is treated, and the self-sacrifice required is graver than the Greek also. The Christian aim is not balance or harmony or even total adaptation to a complicated environment as the Greek is; it is to find out how one should behave in God's household. The Christian faith in these epistles becomes a vast moral force which is set at work in society. This moral force braced, deepened, and consolidated the characters of those who came vitally into contact with it.

The author of the Pastorals was eager to show versatility and flexibility when they were needed, and stability when it was called for. He objected to

the false teachers by insisting on a stable doctrine, and showed his people that to identify with them would be disaster for the church. But he did not condemn them outright - he let them condemn themselves. Stability and versatility constitute one of the paradoxes of these epistles.

CHURCH-CONSCIOUS/MISSION-CONSCIOUS: The church in the Pastorals became gathered by choice, not chance. The epistles show an advanced Christianity with a controlled leadership and a well-developed content of belief. But, even more important, they reveal a Christianity which is conscious of diversity within herself, and able and ready to invoke the available criteria to determine the regularity of discipline and the orthodoxy of belief. The Pastorals provide "hope made visible,"[1] through their gatheredness. And their gatheredness has made them church-conscious.

The church in the Pastorals is supremely interested in her own survival, and seems to be governed by a principle detachment from society, especially heretical society. The call is to the church, through her members, to be separate, holy, and spotless. The emphasis is upon building up the church as an institution which rescues and removes individuals from the world.

The Pastoral church is under constant temptation to despair of the world, constantly tempted to look inwards upon herself, and to concern herself with her own domestic cares. Therefore, the church could fall into the danger of developing an esoteric kind of morality, a narrow understanding of holiness, and could even become self-righteous and pharisaical.

The church has become in the time of Pastoral Epistles, and to a large extent remains today, a community which is interested in its own survival and prosperity. This type of church is church-conscious and can easily fall into the contemporary problem of not being mission-conscious.

---

[1]This terminology was taken from Harvey Cox, The Secular City, (SCM Press, London, 1965), p. 144; who calls the church a "hope made visible, a kind of living picture of character and composition of the true city of man for which the church strives."

Today, if the church is not mission-conscious, it is on the way to death. Mission can no longer be even the most emphasized activity of the contemporary church; it has to become the core of congregational life.[1] The church is mission, rather than mission being understood as the extended arm of congregational activity.[2]

A quick glance at the Pastoral Epistles tends to make one believe they are not mission-conscious. With all their emphasis on stability and gatheredness, it is difficult at surface level to see the church in mission, or as mission, in these epistles. For the church in the Pastorals is presented as the pillar and bulwark of the truth, and it might be suggested that it fails to meet people where they are and as they are, as the modern church has been thrust into doing.[3] Archie Hargraves puts the idea of mission graphically when he compares the work of God in the world to a "floating crap game," and the church to a gambler whose "major compulsion upon arising each day is to know where the action is."[4] Such compulsion is not really evident in the Pastorals, but there is a hint of this sense of mission as we read between the lines.

In the liturgy of the Pastoral church we see a window of mission. It was through the liturgy that the early church professed publicly that she accepted the mission and that she reaffirmed her resolution to carry out her task. It was through the liturgy that she demonstrated the quality and character of the Kingdom of God by her own life in koinonia.

---

[1] J. C. Hoekendijk, The Church Inside Out, (Westminister Press, Philadelphia, 1964), pp. 32-46; emphasizes this new concept to mission.

[2] Reitz, op. cit., p. 29.

[3] Reitz, op. cit., p. 154; gives us a good example of going where the people are with the Angora Shopping Center Ministry in Oakbrook, Illinois. One of the workers in this ministry remarked that: "She (the church) must meet people where they carry on their most vital tasks;" and John Perry, Coffee House Ministry, (John Knox Press, Richmond, Va., 1966), is an excellent book on another type of approach today with youth. The Coffee House is a place of dialogue and discussion out from the traditional church structure.

[4] Archie Hargraves, "Go Where the Action Is," Social Action, (Feb., 1964), p.17.

One completely legitimate and necessary process for early Christianity to struggle with, was the confrontation between it and other worlds. For instance, an example is the Hellenistic world, which she was trying to conquer. There was growing adaption of the Christian kergyma to this Hellenistic world. The Christian church knew that this was where she was to find her audience; and therefore adapted herself, but used methods, and especially terminology, that communicated to the Hellenistic world. As has already been emphasized, the Pastorals did borrow from the Hellenistic world. But, did they give to it also? Were they in mission to it? Looking at the ethics of the Pastorals, we can see a moral teaching completely relevant for today, and even more for the period in which they were written. If the broad ethical teaching and pattern of New Testament morality is to be examined for value in the Pastorals, then we have to recognise immediatedly that it stands in a rather stiff framework. As has been stated in the ethics section, the theological character of Christian morality is found in sound doctrine or sound words. This emphasis on moral health and soundness is typical of these epistles. Thus the Pastoral author continues to remind people of their responsibility in this field of being sound in faith, in love and in patience (Tit. 2:2). Titus is also supposed to remember that certain persons should be reproved, that they may be kept sound in the faith (Tit. 1:13). And this is where the church in these epistles is mission-conscious in the field of ethics. For it is at this point that the Pastorals indicate a close connection between faith and morals. Faith basically adorns the doctrine (Tit. 2:10).

Amidst the turmoil of striving to find an ethic for man in the twentieth century, it would be wise for the church to remember these prophetic words of the Pastoral author. If faith adorned our contemporary ethical and moral decisions, there would be less vacillating between beliefs, and more solidarity in

moral decisions. Especially does the churchman of today need to recognise this when he is confronted on all sides with a permissive ethic which allows him to be and do what he wants, as long as he does not hurt anyone.[1] This type of moral and not legalistic response is relevant today, but only, according to the Pastoral author, if the intimate connection between faith and morals exists. The church in these epistles is mission-conscious in that she wants to assist the Hellenized world to Christianize its ethic. The Pastoral author would not be against any ethical response in which faith and morals went hand in hand in decisions. If they are divided, the chance of a mature Christian decision is bleak. To the Pastoral author, a person's moral judgement can be perfectly sound only when he believes rightly. Faith and good conscience (1 Tim. 1:5, 19), and faith and pure conscience (1 Tim. 3:9), dominate the views of these epistles on morality as they try to missionize the Hellenistic world.

Another evident sign in these epistles that the church is mission-conscious is in her approach to the character of her leadership. The total emphasis is upon a disciplined and godly character, free to carry out responsibility. Again, at first glance the church in these epistles is just an institution, but at heart she is a people. She is the laos theou, the people of God. Harvey Cox says the church should be "a people whose institutions should enable them to participate in God's action in the world."[2] And that is how the church-conscious, stability-conscious Pastoral Epistles become the scattered, mission-conscious, witnessing community. They demand a great deal from their people in order to liberate them for freedom and responsibility in the world. The church exists in herself, but she does not exist for herself. She has a mission to the world and a responsibility for it.

---

[1] The most well known exponent of this theory is Joseph Fletcher, in his book, Situation Ethics.

[2] Cox, op. cit., p. 125.

Therefore, it is easy to see that these epistles again present us with a paradox. They are church-conscious on the one hand, and mission-conscious on the other. And this is certainly relevant today. For the contemporary church to maintain these roles in a proper balance is a must. The twentieth century church is overweight in preserving its tradition and underweight in freeing its people to serve the world.

CHURCHLY ECUMENISM/SECULAR ECUMENISM: In reading the Pastorals it would be easy to fall into the error of seeing in them a churchly ecumenism as opposed to a secular ecumenism. The present writer would like to go on to say this is not really the case.

The environment of that day seemed to call for an approach that emphasized churchly ecumenism; that is, the Pastorals emphasize a specific, almost narrow concept of religion. This is the approach of stability and strength and unity. A radically disunited church could only have provided an ambiguous witness as it attempted to proclaim and embody the reality of the Kingdom. Therefore, the church in Asia Minor chose this approach to society. This is found in the theology of the Pastorals. To some degree the Pastoral author was faced with the same difficulty as today's church faces. A generation was growing up within the community whose conception of the faith and mission was different from that of those who preceded them. Ideas foreign to Christianity flourished within the walls of the church, introducing pagan ideas and habits. The fact that many adherents of Christianity had already formed close associations with the synagogue meant an inevitable intrusion of the central elements of Judaism. A monotheism implying a uniquely transcendent God, a rather strict doctrine of retribution, and a legal conception of the Divine will as manifested in a code of detailed injunctions,[1] were factors of importance in the

[1]Kennedy, op. cit., (T), p. 224.

developing church's theology, which added to the already heavy side of the church - churchly ecumenism.

The ideal Christian citizenship is described in the Pastorals in the general conception of ethics. Christians are adjusting themselves to the world. They are ordering their own life in society and reckoning with the continuance of the church. The sober life is worth striving for (Tit. 2:12), and good works need to be done (1 Tim. 2:10). The senior citizens are to be cared for and children are to be raised correctly (1 Tim. 3:4, 12, 5:10; Tit. 1:6). Today's church can learn at least two things from this. First, these instructions were already found in secular ethics. Many had been taken from the Hellenistic influence outside the church. And secondly, the church gave these ethics a Christian motive.

Today's church is often divided so sharply from secular society that she becomes "sacredized" and exclusive. The Pastorals can teach today's Christian community that what is being said and done outside its boundaries is not all bad. These epistles take high moral standards from Greek ethics and place a Christian motive behind them. They encourage one to continue what he has learned (2 Tim. 3:14), but at the same time to direct one's life as sound doctrine demands (Tit. 1:9). For example, today's popular music repels many Christians because the sound is so loud, and the words are hard to understand. But, if the church will listen to those words, they will find and ocean of hope in the contemporary 'pop' writers. A Christian motive behind these words will virtually develop our future hymns. These modern songs sing out for guidance, and Christianity should have hope and guidance for the singers. Just as the Hellenistic influence on the Pastoral Epistles was not bad, so the influence of modern music on the church cannot be all horrible.

The difficulty with the present church is that she has followed the Pastorals message and not their method. Today the church is doing too much

navel-gazing when it should become the servant to society. Secular ecumenism is not without God, or Christ, or the church. But it does mean leaving the narrow concept of religion behind, and this is hinted at in the Pastorals. Religion in our time is often understood as purely otherworldly. That is to say, it has nothing to do with the concerns of this world. This notion is carried further by the feeling that religion is completely preoccupied with the sphere of private morality and ethics, and has no place for the social, political or cultural areas of life. To be involved in the secular side of Christianity means to immerse oneself in the world. The secular approach to Christianity addresses itself to the world and is meant to be applicable to the needs of this world. The Pastorals are involved in the world, and even though they seem to be totally involved in churchly ecumenism, they shed light on secular ecumenism.

There can be no future for a church which cares too little about the shape of the future, or about the welfare of the emerging human community. The world needs today, as it needed in the time of the Pastorals, a church which offers herself and all her moral resources as the embodiment of concern and as one of charity's principal instruments. The church is to be the diakonos of the community; and this is where the church in the Pastorals was moving, and this is the area in which she was getting involved. She had established herself, and gathered herself inward, as every church must do in her infancy. But she shows signs of breaking out of her church ecumenism into secular ecumenism. This is another paradox of these epistles. They seem to show on the surface one thing, but when studied in depth exemplify another.

J. A. T. Robinson said that the church "must be the Son of Man on earth, an open society, an accepting community, whose chief characteristic is that it is prepared to meet men where they are and accept them for what they are."[1]

[1]J. A. T. Robinson, The New Reformation?, (SCM Press, London, 1965), p. 36.

The Pastorals may not have quite reached that, but they faced what today's church faces - taking a loving gospel, and placing it in a changing environment, which means flexibility as well as stability, being mission-conscious as well as church-conscious, and being willing to be in the secular world, yet not of it.

What, then, is the value of these epistles for today? It would be easy to list ethically, organizationally and theologically their depth and shallowness, their value and shortcomings. But these epistles have not been written for that reason. They were written to be read, digested and hopefully used as a guideline to further decisions of the church.

The value of the Pastorals lies not so much in what they say, as in what they attempt to do. They remind us to do what they were doing - to be stable, to identify with the community, to create a Christian ethic, to ethicize theology - not necessarily in the way in which they did so. They represent a church living, growing and developing. They are involved in the organization within the church structure as well as in the ministry outside. The author was a significant thinker who used his own ability to adapt and present his material in such a way as to support and further the Christian faith. He was an earnest man with lofty ideals, which he sometimes expressed in powerful language. He had an understanding of Christianity in a different light than that of Paul. And probably most important, this author shows us incomparable glimpses into the conditions and tensions of the church's life, and especially her reactions to the secular world. This author offers a practical religion for all concerned and his wise teaching will never be out of date.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(the following Bibliography is limited only to the books quoted from by the author)

Abrahams, I., Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels, Cambridge, 1917.

Alexander, A. B. D., Christianity and Ethics, Duckworth and Co., London, 1914.

_____, The Ethics of St. Paul, James Maclehcuse and Sons, Glasgow, 1910.

Alland, T. G., The Origin and Evolution of the Christian Church, Hutchinson's University Library, London.

von Allmen, J., Vocabulary of the Bible, Lutterworth Press, London, 1958.

Angus, S., The Environment of Early Christianity, Duckworth and Co., London, 1914.

_____, The Mystery-Religions and Christianity, John Murray, London, 1925.

_____, The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World, John Murray, London, 1929.

Anrich, G., Das antike Mysterienwesen in seinem Einfluss auf das Christentum, Gott, 1894.

Arndt, W. R., and F. W. Gindrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, Cambridge at the University Press, 1957.

Arnold, E. V., Roman Stoicism, Cambridge at the University Press, 1911.

Aust, E., Die Religion der Romer, Munster, 1889.

Bailey, Cyril, Religion in Virgil, Oxford, 1935.

Barclay, William, A New Testament Wordbook, SCM Press, London, 1955.

_____, More New Testament Words, SCM Press, London, 1958.

_____, The Letters to Timothy, Titus and Philemon, St. Andrews Press, Edinburgh, 1956.

_____, The Mind of St. Paul, Collins, London, 1958.

_____, The New Testament, vol. 1 and 2, Collins, London, 1969.

Barnard, L. W., Studies in the Apostolic Fathers and Their Background, Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1966.

Barrett, C. K., Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation, (Klassen and Snyder, editors), London, 1962.

_____, The New Testament Background: Selected Documents, SPCK, London, 1956.

_____, The Pastoral Epistles, Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1963.

Barth, Karl, Church Dogmatics, (G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance, editors), T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1957.

_____, The Epistle to the Romans, (trans. by E. C. Hoskyns), Oxford University Press, 1933.

Basore, John W., Seneca, William Heinemann, London, 1928

Baur, F. C., Ueber den Ursprung des Episcopats in den Christlichen, Tubingen, 1838.

Berkhof, Hendrikus, The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, The Epworth Press, London, 1964.

Bevan, Edwin, Hellenism and Christianity, George Allen and Unwin, London, 1921.

_____, Stoics and Sceptics, Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1913.

Beyer, K., Semitische Syntax im New Testament, vol. 1, 1962.

Beyschlag, Willibald, New Testament Theology, vol. 2, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1895.

Bigg, C., The Church's Task Under the Roman Empire, Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1905.

Black, Matthew, H. H. Rowley, editors, Peakes Commentary on the Bible, Thomas Nelson and Sons, London, 1962.

_____, The Scrolls and Christian Origins, Nelson, Edinburgh, 1961.

Blass, F., Grammar of New Testament Greek, (trans. by Henry Thackeray), London, 1898.

Bonhoeffer, Adolf, Epiktet und das Neue Testament, Gieben, 1911.

Bonhoeffer, Deitrich, Ethics, SCM Press, London, 1955.

Bornkamm, G., Das Ende des Gesetzes, Gottingen, 1956.

Bousset, W., Kyrios Christos, 1st edition, Gottingen, 1913.

Brown, E. F., The Pastoral Epistles, Methuen and Co., London, 1917.

Brunner, Emil, The Mediator, trans. by Olive Wyon, Lutterworth Press, London, 1934.

Buckland, W. W., The Roman Law of Slavery, Cambridge, 1909.

Bultmann, Rudolf, Primitive Christianity, (trans. by R. H. Fuller), Living Age Books, Meridan, New York, 1956.

_____, Theology of the New Testament, vol. 1 and 2, SCM Press, London, 1955.

de Burgh, W. G., The Legacy of the Ancient World, MacDonald and Evans, London, 1924.

Burkitt, F. C., Christian Beginnings, University of London Press, London, 1924.

_____, Christian Worship, Cambridge at the University Press, 1930.

Burton, E., Galatians, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1921.

_____, The Heresies of the Apostolic Age, Oxford, 1829.

Bury, R. G., Sextus Empiricus, William Heinemann, London, 1933.

Bussel, F. W., School of Plato, London, 1896.

Buttrick, G. A., editor, The Interpreters Bible, Abingdon, New York, 1952.

_____, The Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible, Abingdon, New York, 1962.

Caird, Edward, The Evolution of Religion, James Maclehouse and Sons, Glasgow, 1893.

Calvin, John, Calvin's Commentaries, (trans. by T. A. Smail), Oliver and Boyd, 1964.

_____, Commentaries on the Epistles to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon, Calvin Translation Society, 1856.

_____, Institutes of the Christian Religion, vol. 2, SCM Press, London, 1961.

von Campenhausen, H., Kirchliches Amt und geistliche Vollmacht in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten, Tubingen, 1963.

Carrington, Philip, The Early Christian Church, vol. 1 and 2, Cambridge University Press, 1957.

Cary, E., Roman History, William Heinemann, London.

Cary, M. and T. J. Haarhoff, Life and Thought in the Greek and Roman World, Methuen and Co., London, 1940.

Case, S. J., The Evolution of Early Christianity, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1914.

Cerfaux, L, The Church in the Theology of St. Paul, (trans. by G. Webb, and A. Walker), Herder and Herder, New York, 1959.

Church, A. J., and W. J. Brodribb, Annals of Tacitus, MacMillan and Co., London, 1879.

Clogg, F. B., An Introduction to the New Testament, University of London Press, 1937.

Coleman, Lyman, The Apostolical and Primitive Church, Boston: Gould, Kendall, and Lincoln, 1844.

Colson, F. H., Philo, William Heinemann, London, 1935.

_____, and G. H. Whitaker, Philo, William Heinemann, London, 1949.

Conzelmann, Hans, An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament, SCM Press, London, 1968.

Cox, Harvey, The Secular City, SCM Press, London, 1965.

Craig, C. T., The Beginnings of Christianity, Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, New York, 1943.

Cullmann, Oscar, Early Christian Worship, (trans. by A. S. Todd and J. B. Torrance), SCM Press, London, 1953.

_____, The Christology of the New Testament, SCM Press, London, 1959.

_____, The Earliest Christian Confessions, (trans. by J. K. Reid), Lutterworth Press, 1949.

Cumont, Franz, The Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism, The Open Court Publishing Co., Chicago, 1911.

Cunningham, William, Epistle of St. Barnabas, MacMillan and Co., London, 1877.

Davies, J. G., A Select Liturgical Lexicon, London, 1964.

Deismann, Adolf, Biblical Studies, (trans. by A. Grieve), T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1901.

_____, Light From the Ancient East, (trans. by L. R. M. Strachan), Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1910.

Delling, Gerhard, Worship in the New Testament, The Westminster Press, 1962.

DeWar, Lindsay, An Outline of New Testament Ethics, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1949.

Dibelius, Martin, Die Pastoralbriefe, 3rd edition, revised by Hans Conzelmann, Tubingen, 1955.

Digby, John, Epicurus' Morals, Sam Briscoe, London, 1712.

Dill, Samuel, Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius, MacMillan and Co., London, 1905.

Dix, Dom Gregory, The Shape of the Liturgy, Dacre Press, Westminster, 1945.

Dodd, C. H., Epistle of Paul to the Romans, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1932.

_____, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, Cambridge University Press, 1953.

Dollinger, J. J. I., The Gentile and the Jew, vol. 2, London.

Donaldson, James, The Apostolical Fathers, MacMillan and Co., London, 1874.

_____, The Writings of Tertullian, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1869.

Doresse, Jean, The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics, Hollis and Carter, London, 1960.

Duchesne, Mgr. L., Christian Worship, MacMillan Co., London, 1931.

_____, Early History of the Christian Church, John Murray, London, 1910.

Dugmore, C. W., The Influence of the Synagogue Upon the Divine Office, Oxford University Press, 1944.

Duncan, G. S., St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1929.

Easton, B. S., The Pastoral Epistles, London, 1948.

Eichholz, D. E., Pliny, Natural Histories, William Heinemann, London, 1942.

Ewing, W., and J. E. H. Thomson, Dictionary of the Bible, J. M. Dent and Sons, London, 1910.

Falconer, Robert, The Pastoral Epistles, Oxford at the University Press, 1937.

Farnell, L. R., The Cults and the Greek States, Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1896.

Farrar, F. W., The Early Days of Christianity, Cassell and Co., London, 1884.

Faulkner, J. A., Burning Questions in Historic Christianity, Abingdon Press, New York, 1930.

Feine, Paul, Theologie des Neuen Testaments, Leipzig, 1910.

Filson, Floyd V., Jesus Christ the Risen Lord, Abingdon Press, Nashville, 1956.

Findlay, G. G., The Epistles of the Apostle Paul, C. H. Kelly, London.

Fisher, G. P., The Beginnings of Christianity, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1878.

Foakes-Jackson, F. J., Studies in the Life of the Early Church, George H. Doran, New York, 1924.

Foster, B. O., Livy, William Heinemann, London, 1929.

Fowler, H. N., Plato, William Heinemann, London, 1914.

Fowler, W. W., Social Life at Rome, MacMillan and Co., London, 1908.

_____, The City-State, MacMillan and Co., London, 1911.

_____, The Religious Experience of the Roman People, MacMillan and Co., London, 1911.

Freese, J. H., Aristotle, The Art of Rhetoric, William Heinemann, London, 1947.

Frere, W. H., The Anaphora, The MacMillan Co., New York, 1938.

Friedlander, Ludwig, Roman Life and Manners Under the Early Empire, George Routledge and Sons, London.

_____, Synagoge und Kirche ihren Anfangen, Berlin, 1908.

Fyfe, W. H., Aristotle, Poetics, William Heinemann, London.

Gartner, Bertil, The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament, Cambridge, 1965.

Gibbon Edward, The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, Methuen and Co., vol. 1-7, London, 1879.

Gilbert, G. H., The First Interpreters of Jesus, MacMillan Co., New York, 1901.

Glover, T. R., Christ in the Ancient World, Cambridge at the University Press, 1929.

_____, The Ancient World, Cambridge at the University Press, 1935.

_____, The Conflict of Relgions in the Early Roman Empire, Methuen and Co., London, 1909.

_____, The Influence of Christ in the Ancient World, Cambridge at the University Press, 1929.

Godet, F., Introduction to the New Testament, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1894.

Goguel, Maurice, The Birth of Christianity, (trans. by H. C. Snape) London, 1953.

_____, The Primitive Church, MacMillan and Co., New York, 1964.

Goodspeed, Edgar J., An Introduction to the New Testament, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1939.

Gore, Charles, The Ministry of the Christian Church, Longmans, Green and Co., London, 1893.

Grant, F. C., and H. H. Rowley, Dictionary of the Bible, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1963.

Grant, F. C., The Early Days of Christianity, Abingdon Press, New York, 1922.

_____, The Gospels: Their Origin and Growth, Faber and Faber, London, 1959.

Grant, R. M., Gnosticism, Collins, London, 1961.

_____, Gnosticism and Early Christianity, Columbia University Press, New York, 1959.

Groningen, G. van, First Century Gnosticism, E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1967.

Guignebert, C., The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus, (trans. by S. H. Hooke) Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1939.

Gummere, R. M., Seneca, Epistulae Morales, Harvard University Press, 1934.

Guthrie, Donald, The Pastoral Epistles, The Tyndale Press, London, 1957.

_____, The Pastoral Epistles and Mind of Paul, London, 1956.

Gwatkin, H. M., The Knowledge of God, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1906.

Hahn, W., Worship and Congregation, Lutterworth Press, London, 1963.

Halliday, W. R., The Pagan Background of Early Christianity, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1925.

Hanson, A. T., Studies in the Pastoral Epistles, SPCK, London, 1968.

_____, The Pastoral Letters, Cambridge at the University Press, 1966.

Harnack, Adolf, The Constitution and Law of the Church in the First Two Centuries, Williams and Norgate, London, 1910.

_____, The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries, Williams and Norgate, London, vol. 1 and 2, 1904.

Harrison, P. N., Polycarps Two Epistles to the Philippians, Cambridge, 1936.

_____, The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles, Oxford University Press, London, 1921.

Hastings, James, Dictionary of the Bible, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1909.

_____, Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1908.

Hatch, Edwin, The Influence of Greek Ideas Upon the Christian Church, Williams and Norgate, London, 1898.

_____, The Organization of the Early Christian Churches, Rivingtons, London, 1881.

Helmbold, W. C., Plutarch's Moralis, William Heinemann, London, 1962.

Hicks, R. D., Diogenes Laertius, William Heinemann, London, 1925.

Hillard, A. E., The Pastoral Epistles, Rivingtons, London, 1919.

Hislop, D. H., Our Heritage in Public Worship, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1935.

Hoekendijk, J. C., The Church Inside Out, Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1964.

Holmes, Peter, Tertullian Against Marcion, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1868.

_____, The Writings of Tertullian, vol. 2, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1870.

Holtzmann, H. J., Die Pastoralbriefe, Leipzig, 1880.

Hopkins, E. W., The History of Religions, The MacMillan Co., New York, 1918.

Hort, F. J. A., Judaistic Christianity, MacMillan and Co., London, 1894.

Hort, F. J. A., The Christian Ecclesia, MacMillan and Co., London, 1908.

_____, The Epistle of St. James, MacMillan and Co., London, 1909.

Huby, P. M., Greek Ethics, MacMillan and Co., London, 1967.

Hunter, A. M., The Gospel According to St. Paul, SCM Press, London.

Jackson, John, Marcus Aurelius, Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1906.

Jalland, T. G., The Origin and Evolution of the Christian Church, Hutchinsons University Library, London, 1948.

James, J. D., The Genuineness and Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles, Longmans, Green and Co., London, 1906.

Jeremias, J. J., Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus, Gottingen, 1934.

Jonas, Hans, The Gnostic Religion, Beacon Hill Press, Boston, 1958.

Jones, H. L., The Geography of Strabo, William Heinemann, London, 1923.

Jones, Maurice, The New Testament in Twentieth Century, MacMillan and Co., London, 1934.

Julicher, A., and E. Fascher, Einleitung in das Neun Testament, 1931.

Jungman, Josef A., The Early Liturgy, Darton, Longman, and Todd, London, 1960.

Kaerst, J., Geschichte des hellenistischen Zeitalters, vol. 1, Leipzig, 1901-1909.

Kasemann, Ernst, Essays on New Testament Themes, SCM Press, London, 1964.

_____, Jesus Means Freedom, (trans. by F. Clarke), SCM Press, London, 1969.

_____, Neutestamentliche Studien fur Rudolf Bultmann, Tubingen, 1954.

Kellett, E. E., A Short History of Religions, Victor Gollancz, London, 1933.

Kelly, J. N. D., A Commentary of the Pastoral Epistles, Adam and Charles Black, London, 1963.

_____, Early Christian Doctrines, Adam and Charles Black, London, 1958.

Kennedy, H. A. A., The Theology of the Epistles, Duckworth and Co., London, 1919.

King, J. E., Cicero, Tusculan Disputations, William Heinemann, London, 1928.

Kirk, Kenneth E., The Apostolic Ministry, Morehouse-Gorham Co. New York, 1946.

_____, The Study of Theology, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1939.

Kittel, Gerhard, Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, (trans. by G. Bromley), William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1964.

Kleist, J. A., The Epistles of St. Clement of Rome and St. Ignatius of Antioch, The Newman Bookshop, 1946.

_____, The Epistles and the Martyrdom of St. Polycarp, Longmans, Green and Co., London, 1948.

Klijn, A. F. J., The Acts of Thomas, Leiden, 1962.

Knox, John, The Early Church, Abingdon Press, New York, 1955.

Kronkel, Max, Beitrage zur Aufhellung der Gerchichte und der Briefe des Apostels Paulus, Braunschw, 1890

Kummel, W. G., Introduction to the New Testament, Abingdon Press, Nashville, 1965.

L'Estrange, Roger, Senecas Morals, T. Osborne, London, 1762.

Lake, Kirsop, Eusebius, (Ecc. Hist.), William Heinemann, London, 1926.

_____, The Apostolic Fathers, vol. 1 and 2, MacMillan and Co., London, 1912.

_____, The Stewardship of Faith, Christophers, London, 1915.

Lamb, W. R. W., Plato, William Heinemann, London, 1946.

Latourette, K. S., A History of Christiantiy, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1953.

_____, The First Five Centuries, Eyre and Spottiswoode, London, 1943.

Lecky, W. E. H., History of European Morals, Longmans, Green and Co., London, 1913.

Legge, F., Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity, Cambridge at the University Press, 1915.

Leenhardt, Franz J., The Epistle to the Romans, Lutterworth Press, London, 1961.

Leitzmann, Hans, The Founding of the Church Universal, Nicholson and Watson, London, 1938.

Liddell, H. G., and Robert Scott, A Greek English Lexicon, Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1951.

Lightfoot, J. B., Biblical Essays, MacMillan and Co., London, 1893.

_____, St. Pauls Epistle to the Philippians, MacMillan and Co., London, 1868.

_____, The Christian Ministry, MacMillan and Co., London, 1901.

Lindsay, Thomas M., The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1902.

Lock, Walter, The Pastoral Epistles, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1936.

Loisy, A. F., The Birth of the Christian Religion, University Books, New York, 1962.

Loofs, Friedrich, Studien und Kritiken, Leipzig, 1890.

Luthhardt, C. E., History of Christian Ethics, (trans. by W. Hastie), T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1889.

MacDonald, A. B., Christian Worship in the Primitive Church, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1934.

MacGregor, G. H. C., and A. C. Purdy, Jew and Greek: Tutors Unto Christ, Ivor Nicholson, and Watson, London, 1936.

Mackintosh, H. R., The Person of Jesus Christ, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1914.

MacMahon, J. H., The Refutation of all Heresies by Hippolytus, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1868.

MacPherson, John, Epistle to the Romans, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1892.

Mansel, H. L., The Gnostic Heresies of the First and Second Centuries, John Murray, London, 1875.

Marchant, F. C., Xenophon, (Mem.), William Heinemann, London, 1923.

Marcus, Ralph, Josephus (Antiquities), William Heinemann, London, 1937.

Marsh, H. G., The Origin and Significance of the New Testament Baptism, Manchester University Press, 1941.

Marshall, L. H., The Challenge of the New Testament Ethics, MacMillan and Co., London, 1956.

Matheson, P. E., Epictetus, vol. 1, Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1916.

Maxwell, W. D., An Outline of Christian Worship, Oxford University Press, 1936.

Mayor, J. B., Epistle of St. James, MacMillan and Co., London, 1892.

McGiffert, A. C., A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1897.

McNeile, A. H., New Testament in the Light of St. Paul's, Cambridge at the University Press, 1923.

Menzies, Allan, History of Religion, John Murray, London, 1911.

Merivale, Charles, History of the Romans, Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts and Green, 1864.

Micklem, Nathaniel, Christian Worship, Oxford University Press, 1936.

Miller, Walter, Cicero, William Heinemann, London, 1938.

Milligan, George, Here and There Among the Papyri, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1923.

Moffatt, James, An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1911.

Mommsen, Th., History of Rome, (trans. by W. P. Dickson), Richard Bentley, London, 1862.

Moore, C. H., Tacitus, (The Histories), vol. 1, William Heinemann, London, 1925.

_____, The Religious Thoughts of the Greeks, Cambridge Mass., 1916.

Moore, G. F., History of Religions, vol. 1 and 2, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1914.

_____, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era, Cambridge, 1927.

Moule, C. F. D., Worship in the New Testament, Lutterworth Press, London, 1961.

Moulton, J. H., Grammar of the New Testament Greek, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1906.

Moulton, J. H., and G. Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1944.

Murray, A. T., Homer, William Heinemann, London, 1946.

_____, The Iliad, William Heinemann, London, 1946.

Murray, Gilbert, Five Stages of Greek Religion, Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1925.

_____, Stoic, Christian and Humanist, C. A. Watts, London, 1940.

_____, The Rise of the Greek Epic, Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1907.

Murray, J. C., A Handbook of Christian Ethics, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1908.

Myers, J. L., A History of Rome, Rivingtons, London, 1910.

Nageli, Th., Der Wortschatz des Apostels Paulus, 1905.

Neill, Stephen, The Interpretation of the New Testament, Oxford University Press, 1964.

Niven, W. D., The Conflicts of the Early Church, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1930.

Nock, A. D., Conversion, Oxford at the University Press, 1933.

Oesterley, W. O. E., The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy, Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1925.

Oetting, Walter W., The Church of the Catacombs, Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo., 1964.

Oldfather, W. A., Epictetus, vol. 1 and 2, William Heinemann, London, 1928.

Parry, R. St. John, The Pastoral Epistles, Cambridge at the University Press, 1920.

Pauly, A. F., Georg Wissowa, and Kroll, Real-Encyclopadie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, Stuttgart, 1894.

Peake, A. S., Expositor's Greek Teatament, iii, London, 1903.

Peck, A. L., Aristotle, (Parts of Animals), William Heinemann, London, 1957.

Percy, Ernst, Probleme der Kolosser und Epheserbriefe, Lund, 1946.

Perrin, E., Plutarch, William Heinemann, London, 1920.

Perry, John D., The Coffee House Ministry, John Knox Press, Richmond, Va., 1966.

Pierce, C. A., Conscience in the New Testament, SCM Press, London, 1955.

Plummer, Alfred, The Pastoral Epistles, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1888.

Poland, Franz, Geschichte des griechishen Vereinswesens, Leipzig, 1909.

de Pressense, Edmund Christian Life and Practice in the Early Church, Hodder & Stoughton, 1877.

_____, Religions Before Christ, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1842.

_____, The Ancient World of Christianity, (trans. by A.H. Holmden), Hodder, and Stoughton, London, 1898.

Puech, H.C., and G. Quispel, and W. C. van Unnik, The Jung Codex, (F.L. Cross, editor), A. R. Mowray, London 1955.

Rabbinowitz, Joseph, Mishna Megillah, Oxford Un. Press, London, 1931.

Rackham, H., Aristotle, (The Nicomachean Ethics), William Heinemann, London 1936.

_____, Pliny, Natural History, William Heinemann, London, 1947.

Ramsay, G. G., Annals of Tacitus, John Murray, London, 1904.

_____, Juvenal and Persius, Wm. Heinemann, London, 1918.

Reicke, Bo, The New Testament Era, (trans. by DE Green), Adam and Charles Black, London, 1968.

Reid, J. K. S., The Biblical Doctrine of the Ministry, (Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers No. 4), Oliver & Boyd, Edinburgh, 1955.

Reitz, Rudiger, The Church in Experiment, Abingdon Press, New York, 1969

Reitzenstein, R., Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen, Leipzig, 1910.

Richardson, Alan, An Introduction to the Theology to the New Testament, SCM Press, London.

Riddle, D. W. Early Christian Life, Willett, Clark and Co., New York, 1936.

Ritshl, Albrecht, Die Entstehung der Altkatholischen Kirche, Bonn, 1857.

Rivingstone, R. W., The Mission of Greece, Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1928.

Roberts, A. and W. H. Rambaut, The Writings of Iranaeus, (Adv. Haer.) T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1868.

Roberts, Alexander, and James Donaldson, The Writings of Tertullian, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1869.

Roberts, W. R., Longinus on the Subline, Cambridge at the University Press, 1907.

Robinson, J. A., Barnabas, Herman and the Didache, The MacMillan Co., New York, 1920.

Robinson, John A. T., Honest to God, SCM Press, London, 1963

_____, The New Reformation?, SCM Press, London, 1965.

Rolfe, J. C., Suetonius, vol. 1 and 2, William Heinemann, London, 1914

Rose, C. R., The Bible Doctrine of Society, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1920.

Rose, H. T., Ancient Greek Religion, Hutchinson's University Library, London, 1946.

Rothe, R., Die Anfange der Christlichen Kirche und ihrer Verassung, Wittenburg, 1837.

Ryrie, C. C., The Place of Women in the Church, MacMillan anc Co., New York, 1958.

Sabatier, A., The Apostle Paul, (trans. by A. M. Hellier), Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1891.

Schaff, Philip, History of the Christian Church, vol. 1 and 2, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1883.

_____, The Oldest Church Manual, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1885.

Schlatter, Adolf, The Church in the New Testament Period, (trans. by Paul Levertoff), SPCK, London, 1955.

Schmithals, W., Die Gnosis in Korinth, Gottingen, 1956.

Schnackenburg, Rudolf, The Moral Teaching of the New Testament, Burns and Oates, London, 1965.

Schurer, D. E., A History of the Jewish People, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1885,

Schweitzer, Albert, Civilization and Ethics, A. and C. Black, Ltd., London, 1923.

Schweizer, Eduard, Church Order in the New Testament, SCM Press, London, 1961.

Scott, C. A. A., Christianity According to St. Paul, Cambridge at the University Press, 1927.

_____, Words, Student Christian Movement Press, London, 1939.

Scott, E. F., The Pastoral Epistles, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1936.

Scullard, H. H., The Ethics of the Gospel, Student Christian Movement, London, 1927.

Sheldon, Henry C., History of the Christian Church, vol. 1, Thomas Y. Crowell and Co., New York, 1894.

Shorey, Paul, Plato, The Republic, vol. 1 and 2, William Heinemann, London, 1946.

Shuckburgh, Evelyn, The Histories of Polybius, MacMillan and Co., London, 1889.

Simpson, E. K., The Pastoral Epistles, The Tyndal Press, London, 1954.

Singer, Isidore, editor, The Jewish Encyclopedia, Funk and Wagnalls, New York, 1905.

Smith, C. F., Thucydides, William Heinemann, London, 1920.

Sohm, Rudolf, Outlines of Church History, MacMillan and Co., London, 1904.

Spicq, C., Les Epitres Pastoales, (Etudes Bibliques), 1948.

Srawley, J. H., The Early History of the Liturgy, Cambridge, 1913.

Stanton, V. H., The Jewish and the Christian Messiah, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1886.

Stauffer, Ethelbert, New Testament Theology, (trans. by John Marsh), SCM Press, London, 1955.

Stevens, G. B., The Theology of the New Testament, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1906.

Storr, F., Sophocles, vol. 1 and 2, William Heinemann, London, 1913.

Strack, H. L., and P. Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch, 3rd edition, Munnich, 1961.

Streeter, B. H., The Primitive Church, MacMillan and Co., London, 1930.

Swete, H. B., Essays on the Early History of the Church and the Ministry, MacMillan and Co., London, 1918.

_____, The Holy Spirit in the New Testament, MacMillan and Co., London, 1910.

Talbert, C. H., Luke and the Gnostics, Nashville, 1966.

Taylor, Vincent, The Person of Christ, MacMillan and Co., London, 1963.

Thackeray, H. St. J., Josephus, (Antiquities), William Heinemann, London, 1930.

_____, The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought, MacMillan and Co., London, 1900.

Thackeray, H. St. J., and Ralph Marcus, Josephus, (Antiquities), William Heinemann, London, 1934.

Thielicke, Helmut, The Ethics of Sex, James Clark and Co., London, 1964.

Thompson, J. E. H., Dictionary of the Bible, J. M. Dent and Sons, London, 1910.

Tiele, C. P., Outlines of the History of Religion, (trans. by J. E. Carpenter), Trubner and Co., London, 1888.

Tollington, R. B., Clement of Alexandria, Williams and Norgate, London, 1914.

Torrance, T. F., Consecration and Ordination, Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh.

Trench, R. C., Synonyms of the New Testament, Kegan, Paul, Trench and Co., London, 1886.

Troeltsch, Ernst, Die Soziallehren der christlichen Kirche, Tubingen, 1912.

Tucker, T. G., Life in the Roman World, MacMillan and Co., London, 1910.

Uhlhorn, Gerhard, The Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism, Sampson, Low, Marston, Searle, and Rivington, London, 1879.

van Unnik, W. C., Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings, SCM Press, London, 1960.

Vokes, F. E., The Riddle of the Didache, MacMillan and Co., New York, 1938.

Voobus, A., Celibacy: A Requirement for Admission to Baptism in the Early Church, Stockholm, 1951.

Watts, N. H., Cicero, The Speeches, William Heinemann, London, 1935.

Wellhausen, J., Israelitsche und judische Geshichte, Berlin, Reimer, 1895.

White, Newport, The Pastoral Epistles, Expositors Greek New Testament, 1910.

Wikenhauser, Alfred, New Testament Introduction, Herder and Herder, New York, 1956.

Wilson, R. McL., Gnosis and the New Testament, Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1968.

_____, The Gnostic Problem, A. R. Mowbray and Co., London, 1958.

Wilson, William, The Writings of Clement of Alexandria, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1869.

Winer, G. B., Grammar of New Testament Greek, (trans. by W. F. Moulton), T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1882.

Wooley, R. M., Liturgy of the Primitive Church, Cambridge at the University Press, 1910.

Zeller, E., Die Philosophie der Griechen, 3rd edition, Leipzig, 1889-92.

_____, Socrates and the Socratic Schools, (trans. by O. J. Reichel), Longmans, Green and Co., London, 1877.

_____, The Stoics, Epicureans, and Sceptics, (trans. by O. J. Reichel), Longmans, Green, and Co., London, 1880.

Zimmern, Alice, Porphyry, The Priory Press, Hampstead, London, 1910.

ARTICLES:

Barclay, William, "Hellenistic Thought in New Testament Times," The Expository Times, vol. LXXI, no. 9 through vol. LXXII, no. 10, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1960-1.

Bartlet, Vernon, The Expositor, Series VIII, vol. 5, 1913.

Grayston, K., and G. Herdon, "The Authorship of the Pastorals in the Light of Statistical Linguistics, New Testament Studies, 6, October, 1959.

Harrison, P. N., "The Pastoral Epistles and Duncan's Ephesian Ministry," New Testament Studies, May, 1956.

Hitchcock, M., "Tests for the Pastorals," Journal of Theological Studies, xxx, 1929.

Kohler, L., "Christus im Alten und in Neuen Testament," Theologische Zeitschrift, no. 9, 1953.

Kuhn, K. G., "Die Sektenschrift und die Iranische Religion," Zeitschrift fur Theologie und Kirche, XLIX, 1952.

LaPiana, George, "Foreign Groups in Rome During the First Centuries of the Empire," Harvard Theological Review, vol. XX, No. 4, October, 1927.

McRay, J., "The Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles," Restoration Quarterly, (1, 1963).

Metzger, B. M., "A Reconsideration of Certain Arguments Against Pauline Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles," Expository Times, 1958-59.

Michaelis, W., "Past. und Wortstatistik," Zeitschrift fur die ntl. Wissenschaft und die Kunde der alteren Kirche, 28, 1929.

Muller-Bardorff, J., "Zur Exegese von 1 Timothy 5:3-16," Festgabe fur E. Fascher, 1959.

Nauck, W., Theologie der Pastoralbriefe, Gottingen, 1950, cf., Literaturzeitung, 79, 1954.

Rankin O. S., "The Extent of the Influence of the Synagogue Service Upon Christian Worship," Journal of Jewish Studies, 1, 1948.

Robbins, Irene M., "St. Paul and the Ministry of Women," Expository Times, XLIV, no. 4, January 1935.

Rose, H. J., "The Clausulae of the Pauline Corpus," Journal of Theological Studies, vol. 25, October, 1923.

Schweizer, E., "Worship in the New Testament," The Reformed and Presbyterian World, xxiv, 5, March, 1957.

Workman, W. P., "The Hapax Legomena of St. Paul," Expository Times, vii, 1896.